58-2

BS1515
.8.S53

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case, SCC Divisi
Shelf, 332 Section
Book, No,

REMARKS

ON

Several very important PROPHECIES.

IN FIVE PARTS.

REMARKS

ON

Several very important Provinces,

IN FIVE PARTS.

REMARKS

ON

Several very important PROPHECIES.

IN FIVE PARTS.

I. Remarks on the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Verſes of the SEVENTH Chapter of ISAIAH, in Anſwer to Dr. W——MS's Critical Diſſertation on the ſame, as approved and republiſhed by the Authors of the Critical Review.

II. A Diſſertation on the Nature and Style of Prophetical Writings, ſhewing that abrupt Tranſitions from one Subject to another are frequently found therein. The ſame being intended to illuſtrate the foregoing Remarks.

III. A Diſſertation on Iſaiah vii. 8.

IV. A Diſſertation on Geneſis xlix. 10.

V. An Anſwer to ſome of the principal Arguments uſed by Dr. W——MS in Defence of his Critical Diſſertation on Iſaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c. in which the Opinions of the late Dr. Sykes and Dr. G. Benſon, concerning Accommodations of Scripture-Prophecy, are briefly conſidered.

THE SECOND EDITION.

By GRANVILLE SHARP.

LONDON:
Printed for B. WHITE, at HORACE'S-HEAD,
FLEET-STREET.
M.DCC.LXXV.

REMARKS

ON THE

Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Verſes,

OF THE

SEVENTH CHAPTER of ISAIAH.

IN ANSWER TO

Dr. W——MS's Critical Diſſertation on the ſame,

As approved and *republiſhed* by

The AUTHORS of the CRITICAL REVIEW.

PART I.

REMARKS

ON THE

Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Verſes of the Seventh Chapter of ISAIAH, &c.

" Hear ye now, O houſe of David, is it a ſmall thing
" for you to weary men, but will you weary my
" God alſo? Therefore the Lord himſelf ſhall give
" you a ſign: Behold, a virgin ſhall conceive, and
" bear a ſon, and ſhall call his name Immanuel.
" Butter and honey ſhall he eat, that he may know
" to refuſe the evil and chooſe the good. For, be-
" fore the child ſhall know to refuſe the evil and
" chooſe the good, the land that thou abhorreſt
" ſhall be forſaken of both her kings."

THIS text has in all ages of Chriſtianity been eſteemed a clear and certain prediction of the miraculous birth of Chriſt; and therefore theſe remarks upon it would have been ſuperfluous, had not a learned and ingenious

ingenious gentleman lately attempted to prove a contrary doctrine (1); viz. "*That* "*the Prophet* (in this text) *had no refe-* "*ference to the Meſſiah* (2)." That "*the* "*words of Iſaiah prove only that a young* "*woman ſhould conceive and bring forth a* "*ſon, without intimating any thing mira-* "*culous in her conception,*" &c. (3) That "*from the moſt careful and impartial ex-* "*amination, the word*" עלמה (here tran- "ſlated a virgin) "*doth not appear to ſig-* "*nify ſtrictly a virgin;*" but that "*it* "*ſeems to mean a young woman in general,* "*without ſpecifying particularly whether* "*ſhe is a virgin or not* (4)."

This writer is not ſingular in his notions, for the authors of the Critical Review have publicly profeſſed themſelves of the ſame opinion concerning this prophecy (ſee No. 136, fo. 349.)—"*The* "*moſt*

(1) See Critical Diſſertation on Iſaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16.

(2) Page 44. (3) P. 21. (4) P. 23.

" *moſt obvious and natural explication* (ſay " they) *is this which Dr. W——ms* (5) " *has adopted,*" &c.

I do not find that they have objected to a ſingle part of the Doctor's work; and therefore this public declaration certainly makes them parties to the whole: nay, perhaps I may ſay with juſtice, that they are more concerned in publiſhing theſe notions to the world, even than the *anonymous author* himſelf; for, inſtead of giving a ſhort extracted account of the work as uſual, they ſeem to have copied the whole, almoſt at length, ſcarcely omitting a ſingle circumſtance.

Now I muſt acknowledge, in juſtice to Dr. W——ms, that I think he has ſet forth his hypotheſis to all the advantage that it is capable of; nevertheleſs, he does not make it appear that the word עלמה

(5) The author of a Concordance to the Greek Teſtament.

in any other place of the Old Teſtament where it occurs, muſt *neceſſarily* ſignify a young woman that was *not* a virgin; without which proof the common acceptation of the ſign promiſed by Iſaiah cannot with juſtice be rejected; eſpecially as a virgin did afterwards conceive and bear a ſon; a miracle which never happened before or ſince the birth of Chriſt! therefore it was certainly a ſign worthy of that great and wonderful event; and, from that time to this, has by all Chriſtians (except the author of the Critical Diſſertation and the authors of the Critical Review) (6) been eſteemed the completion of the ſaid prophecy.

Dr.

(6) Dr. W——ms has ſince informed me of *one other writer* of the ſame opinion concerning this paſſage; (viz. the author of "*The Aſſembly's Confeſſion of Faith examined*," printed in 1651;) but at the ſame time he acknowledges that this authority was not known, even to himſelf, until "*ſeveral months after the Diſſertation was publiſhed:*" and he declares, concerning his own ſentiments of the paſſage, that he apprehended them "*altogether new*" when he wrote; "*for* (ſays he) *I did* "*not then know that any Chriſtian writer had ſo explained* "*it.*"

Dr. W——ms obſerves that the word עלמה occurs only ſeven times in all; and therefore, I hope, it will not take up too much of my readers time, if I attempt to examine the context of theſe ſeveral places, in order to aſcertain the true ſenſe of the word.

The text, wherein the ſignification of this word is eſteemed the moſt doubtful, is in Prov. xxx. 19. where Solomon mentions four things that were too hard for him; in which number (according to the Engliſh tranſlation) he includes "*the way* "*of a man with a maid.*" The ſenſe of this paſſage is very different according to the Syriac verſion, wherein בעלמה is rendered בבחורותא *in his youth*, viz. the way of a man "*in his youth*," and not "*with a maid*," as in the Engliſh verſion. Likewiſe the Latin vulgate, as well as the old Latin verſion of St. Jerome, conforms in ſome degree to the

Syriac, though not intirely; for they conſtrue it, *in adoleſcentia*, (not, in adoleſcentia *ejus*,) which is ſufficiently clear without having recourſe to Dr. Kennicott's (7) expedient of ſuppoſing a corruption in the preſent Heb. text to enable him to read "*in his youth*;" as if it had been written originally בעלמיו.

Nevertheleſs, it appears to me that the common Engliſh tranſlation of this paſſage is to be preferred, and that the word muſt here neceſſarily ſignify a *maid* or *virgin*: for the writer ſeems to allude to the ſecret artifices and allurements uſed by a man in order to ſeduce a virgin; ſuch *artifices* as are hinted at in Exodus xxii. 16. (—"And if a man *entice* a *maid*," בתולה &c.) therefore a word ſignifying merely a young woman, or one that was not eſteemed a virgin, would not have been ſo ſuitable to the context of

(7) See his ſermon preached before the univerſity of Oxford in 1765.—Note 8, page 46.

of either of theſe paſſages. The *way* of a harlot was too well known in former days (as well as the preſent) to be eſteemed a myſtery; and much leſs a myſtery to Solomon, who had "threeſcore queens, *four-*"*ſcore concubines*, and virgins without "number." (See Canticles vi. 8.) But it is not at all unnatural to ſuppoſe that this eaſtern monarch, with all his wiſdom, might ſometimes be perplexed with doubts and jealouſies concerning the virtue and private conduct of ſome of thoſe females (as well virgins as others) with reſpect to other men: this, it ſeems, was by him eſteemed as difficult to be traced as the way of a ſhip in the ſea, an eagle in the air, &c. By the ſin of the adulterous woman (to which the preceding ſimilies allude as being equally uninveſtigable) (8) Solomon repreſents the great difficulty

(8) *Such* is the way of an adulterous woman; ſhe eateth and wipeth her mouth, and ſaith, I have done no wickedneſs. Prov. xxx. 20.

difficulty of detecting the inconſtancy of any particular perſons in the two former claſſes; I mean his queens and concubines; and he would not find it leſs difficult (for ſome time at leaſt) to trace out the *way* (or behaviour) of private admirers towards the third claſs of his women, that were eſteemed *virgins* in the eyes of the world.

In confirmation of this I muſt obſerve, that the ſtrictneſs of the law of Moſes rendered the obſervance of ſecrecy abſolutely neceſſary to offenders in this way: for, if a man was found guilty of *ſeducing a virgin*, (ſee Exodus xxii. 16.) he was obliged not only to pay a heavy fine to the young woman's father, and to take her for his wife, but was likewiſe deprived of an indulgence, which, of all others, ſeemed moſt agreeable to the libidinous diſpoſition of the Jews at that time; and was allowed them by Moſes only

only on account *of the hardneſs of their hearts*; (ſee Matthew xix. 8.) I mean the *giving a bill of divorce*; for, in this caſe, (when a man was obliged to marry one whom he had ſeduced,) he might *not put her away all his days*. (See Deut. xxii. 28.) —A puniſhment of greater mortification to the Jews than any other, which the learned Philo (though himſelf a Jew) candidly acknowledges (9).

This certainly was a ſufficient cauſe for ſecrecy on the man's part; ſo that, whether *his way* (or behaviour) *with a maid* were really criminal, or only imprudent, (for either of them may be implied in the text,) he would, as much as poſſible, conceal it from the world, and render it as *uninveſtigable* as the other things mentioned in the text to be too wonderful for Solomon; at leaſt his beſt endeavours

(9) Και το παντων εκεινοις αηδεσατον, την των γαμων βεβαιωσιν, εαν υπομενωσιν αι γυναικες αυτοις ετι συνοικειν. Fol. 789. Paris Edition, 1640.

endeavours would not be wanting to make it ſo.

Neither can we ſuppoſe that the ſame earneſt endeavours would be wanting on the young woman's part to conceal her diſgrace from her friends as long as ſhe could. But the reaſons for ſecrecy are far more obvious in the caſe of eſpouſed virgins; for, according to the law of Moſes, (Deut. xxii. 23, 24.) if a man was baſe enough to ſeduce one of theſe, an ignominious death was to be the immediate and dreadful conſequence of a diſcovery; when both parties muſt ſhare the ſame wretched fate (10).

Now, if all that I have ſaid ſhall not be thought ſufficient to prove that עלמה in this paſſage muſt neceſſarily ſignify a maid or virgin, I have nevertheleſs the ſatisfaction of obſerving that the author of the objections, in page 20, allows it to

(10) Deut. xxii. 23, 24.

to be "*a very obſcure paſſage*;" and profeſſes to "*lay no ſtreſs upon it*;" and, therefore, I think I may ſafely conclude, at leaſt, that it is incapable of proving any thing againſt the true ſenſe of the word in the other paſſages.

The ſame author obſerves, in page 19, that "other *four places are abſolutely uncertain*;" but they appear in a very different light to me.

In the firſt of theſe places, (Geneſis xxiv. 43.) the word is applied to Rebekah before her marriage, who in the ſame chapter is ſaid expreſſly to be a *virgin*, (בתולה) "*neither had any man known her*." (See 16th verſe.)

In the ſecond place (Exodus ii. 8.) it is applied to Moſes's ſiſter, who watched her infant brother during the time of his being expoſed in the little ark of bulruſhes.

Now, it does not appear that Moſes had any other ſiſter beſides Miriam the propheteſs; (ſee Numb. xxvi. 59. and Exodus xv. 20.) and why her chaſtity ſhould be called in queſtion (eſpecially ſo early in life) I know not!

In the third place, (Pſalm lxviii. 25.) this word with the context expreſſes the damſels playing with timbrels in the ſolemn proceſſions of the ſanctuary; who, had they been damſels ſuſpected of having "*wrought folly in Iſrael,*" (Deut. xxii. 21.) (11) they, ſurely, would not have been permitted to join in this divine ſervice.

The laſt of theſe four places, which the Doctor thinks "*abſolutely uncertain,*" is Canticles i. 3. where the ſame word is applied to the virgins that waited on Solomon's

(11) ——"that ſhe die: becauſe ſhe *hath wrought* "*folly in Iſrael,* to play the whore in her father's "houſe: ſo ſhalt thou put evil away from among you."

lomon's ſpouſe. But this uncertainty is eaſily removed by the other paſſage in Canticles, (chap. vi. ver. 8.) where the ſame word is happily applied to the ſame perſons; who muſt be underſtood to be virgins, becauſe (as Dr. W——ms himſelf acknowledges in page 29) (12) they "*are diſtinguiſhed from queens and concu-*" *bines.*"

This one would ſuppoſe to be an inſurmountable obſtacle to the Doctor's argument; but he paſſes very ſlightly over the difficulty, and contents himſelf with informing us, that "this diſtinction *is no* "*proof at all, becauſe the ſame, indeed* "*a ſtronger, diſtinction is made, Ezek.* "xliv. 22. *in favour of* בתולה."

Now,

(12) ——"I ſhall here add farther, that עלמה "occurs only ſeven times in all; one of which has "the appearance of "*being deciſive in the caſe*, name-"ly, Canticles vi. 8. where virgins *are diſtinguiſhed* "*from queens and concubines.* But this diſtinction is no "proof at all, becauſe the ſame, indeed a ſtronger, "diſtinction, is made, Ezek. xliv. 22. in favour of "בתולה."

Now, I hope the Doctor will excuſe my want of diſcernment in not being able to diſcover *the weight of this reaſon*, againſt ſo ſtrong a proof as the diſtinction in queſtion; becauſe, if בתולה is proved, ever ſo clearly, to ſignify ſtrictly *a virgin*, (and indeed I know no reaſon why any perſon ſhould doubt of it,) yet it is no argument why the other may not *likewiſe ſignify the ſame thing*; for the word *maid*, by having this ſignification in Engliſh, does not oblige us to give a different ſignification to the Engliſh word *virgin*: therefore, I think, I may ſafely conclude, in the Doctors's own words, that this laſt text "*has the appearance of* "*being deciſive in the caſe*;" (ſee page 29.) and that the word עלמה cannot ſignify a young woman that is not a virgin, becauſe, by the ſame word in the plural number, (according to the author's own obſervation,) "virgins

"are

" are (13) distinguished from queens " and concubines."

I propose now to examine whether we may safely acquiesce with the author of the Critical Dissertation, fo. 44. and the authors of the Critical Review (N°. 136,

(13) The ingenious author of the new translation of Solomon's Song observes in his annotations, p. 69, that " the Jewish maidens before marriage were under " such strict confinement, and so rarely suffered to ap- " pear in public, that the very name for a virgin in " Hebrew is עלמה *hidden.*"

This word is well explained by the learned Stockius, p. 820.

" (1) *Generatim & vi originis* notat *latentem.*"

" (2) *Speciatim* (α) *proprie* notat *virginem*, quæ do- " mi latitat & continetur, nec adhuc cum quoquam " rem habuit. Ita dicitur de Rebecca, nondum " propalam nuptam educta, Gen. xxiv. de Mirjam, " quæ nondum rem cum quoquam habuerat, Ex. ii. 8. " de puella incorrupta & illibata, cui vir insidiatur, " ut ea potiatur, Prov. xxx. 19. de matre Immanuelis " illibata & concubitus ignara, Jes. vii. 14."

" (β) *Metaphorice virginum* nomine veniunt *pii sa-* " *luandi*, ad indicandum eorum animi integritatem & " puritatem, tam in doctrina & cultu divino, quam in " vita & moribus, Cant. i. 3. vi. 8," &c. Christiani Stockii Clavis Linguæ sanctæ Veteris Testamenti vocabulorum significationes tum *generales* tum *speciales* ordine concinno exhibens, &c.

136, fo. 359.) in their opinion, that Iſaiah, in his prophecy concerning Immanuel, in the ſeventh chapter, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th verſes, "*had no reference* "*to the Meſſiah.*"

Dr. W——ms objects (in page 9) that the 16th verſe of the ſeventh chapter of Iſaiah "*cannot, in any ſenſe, be* "*applied to the Meſſiah.*" The words of this text, according to the Engliſh tranſlation, are as follows: "For, before *the* "*child ſhall* know to refuſe the evil and "chooſe the good, the land that thou "abhorreſt ſhall be forſaken of both her "kings."

This verſe ſeems to be the principal cauſe of his objections againſt the common interpretation of the two preceding verſes.

Now, though I do not think, with him, that theſe three verſes *muſt, of neceſſity, relate*

relate to the ſame perſon; yet, I apprehend, there is a great probability that *they may*; and that the 16th verſe may reaſonably be accounted for, even when applied to the Meſſiah. Dr. W——ms approves of the meaning given to the word קעץ in the 16th verſe by Mr. Mann, (viz. that it may ſignify "*vexeſt*" inſtead of *abhorreſt,*) "the land which thou (Ahaz) "*vexeſt* with thy idolatry." (See fo. 34.) Thus far he favours the explication which I propoſe to give of this paſſage; but then he ſuppoſes that *the land which Ahaz vexed* ſignifies the land of Judah *only*. "*The Prophet meant* to ſay, accord-"ing to this author, (ſays the Doctor,) "that the land *of Judah*, which Ahaz by "his idolatry and wickedneſs had brought "into trouble and difficulty, ſhould be "delivered from *both theſe kings:*" (fo. 35.) by which the Doctor refers to *Reſin* king of Syria, and *Pekah* the ſon of Remaliah king of Iſrael, who at that time were confederate

federate againſt *Judah*, and "*went up to-*
"*wards Jeruſalem to war againſt it.*" See the firſt part of the ſame chapter.—The Doctor repeats the ſame thing in page 37—viz.—the land *(of Judah)* which thou (Ahaz) vexeſt, &c. This throws great difficulty upon the text, which informs us, that the land which Ahaz vexed ſhould "be forſaken of both *her kings.*" The conſtruction of the word, rendered "*her kings*," requires us to underſtand that both the kings there ſpoken of ſhould be kings of that land which Ahaz vexed: שׁתּי מלכיה "*both her kings.*"

Now, *Pekah king of Iſrael* cannot be underſtood to be one of theſe, if the land, which Ahaz vexed, ſignified the land of Judah alone; for, in what ſenſe could he be called one of the kings of the *land of Judah*, who was not a conqueror, (for the true king ſtill maintained his royal ſeat and title,) but a declared enemy and diſturber, and *king only of Iſrael?*

Neither

Neither could Reſin king of Syria be properly ſaid to be either king of Judah or Iſrael; for he was only an invader of Judah, acting as an ally to the king of Iſrael.

Though indeed he had rather more right to be accounted one of *the kings of Judah* than the king of Iſrael had, becauſe about that time he had taken poſſeſſion of *Elath, a City of Judah:* but this could not really intitle him to be called a king of that land, becauſe, from the time that the city was taken, it ceaſed to be a part of *Judah*, and was accounted a part of the *kingdom of Syria*; for it is expreſsly ſaid in 2 Kings xvi. 6. that "*Reſin* "*king of Syria* recovered Elath *to Syria*, "and *drave the Jews from* Elath: and "the *Syrians* came to Elath, and *dwelt* "*there unto this day.*" Dr. W——ms obſerves in a note (page 37.) that "Reſin

" and Pekah are, perhaps, here called " the kings of Judah, becauſe they were " then in poſſeſſion of all the country, " Jeruſalem excepted;" but the Doctor ſurely did not conſider, that Iſaiah was ſent to confirm Ahaz, that he ſhould not fear " *the two tails of theſe ſmoking fire-* " *brands*," (viz. Reſin and the ſon of Remaliah,) and to aſſure him, that their evil council of *ſetting up a king in Judah ſhould* " *not ſtand*"—nor—" *come to paſs.*" It is not likely, therefore, that the prophet ſhould call either or both of theſe kings *kings of Judah*, becauſe it would have been abſolutely a contradiction to his meſſage, which was to encourage and eſtabliſh *the then reigning king of Judah*, deſcended from the houſe of David. Even the Doctor himſelf ſeems ſo ſenſible of the inſufficiency of his interpretation, that he afterwards, in the ſame note, propoſes another expedient, (though a dangerous

dangerous (14) one,) in hopes of ſolving the difficulty; for the text not being capable of ſerving his purpoſe as it ſtands at preſent, the prophet himſelf muſt be corrected.

This is eſteemed a much eaſier thing, now-a-days, than for a critic to give up a favourite opinion, that happens to be contradictory to the Holy Scripture.

" Suppoſe (ſays the Doctor) that we " ſhould read מלכיהם for מלכיה *her* " *kings? ſhall be forſaken of both kings*" —this indeed is cutting the knot, but it

 will

(14) " Thus it happens with theſe ſacred books as " with prophane authors, that, when the *medica manus* " *criticorum* is to perform an operation upon the text, " it is often diſlocated and maimed, and rendered al- " moſt incurable by improper applications. But, what- " ever may be done with the hiſtorical books, we have " no right to indulge any conjectural emendations in " the prophecies: it looks too much like tampering " with evidence. If they are faulty, they muſt even " remain ſo; and we muſt take the evidence as it " comes to us."

Dr. Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity, p. 265.

will not enable the Doctor to come off conqueror, like the Grecian hero. If the omiſſion of the word αυτης in the Septuagint tranſlation ſhould even be allowed to afford ſufficient grounds for ſuch a ſuppoſition; yet "*Dr. Kennicott's truly* "*important work*" is not likely to furniſh various readings from MSS. equal in authority and antiquity with thoſe from which Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion were taken. Theſe were, manifeſtly, according to the preſent Heb. text in this paſſage; for it is rendered by all theſe tranſlators, των δυο βασιλεων αυτης, of *her* two kings, or of both *her* kings.

The ancient Syriac verſion, likewiſe, confirms the text; ܬܪܝܗ ܡܠܟܗ *both her kings.* It would have been time enough to have quoted Dr. Kennicott's various reading, when it was known that any ſuch ſubſiſted—for it is not fair dealing to wound the credit of the holy text with a mere

a mere "*perhaps*," (15) and for no other purpoſe (if I may uſe the Doctor's own words) than to "*ſtrengthen a conjec-* "*ture.*" In ſhort, I would adviſe the Doctor to let the text remain as he found it; for this unjuſtifiable method of ſolving difficulties is a broken reed, which ſeldom fails to wound the hands of thoſe who uſe it.

Now the difficulty ceaſes, if it be admitted that the *land which Ahaz vexed* ſignified the land or inheritance of the twelve tribes of Iſrael, including Judah; which conſtruction the circumſtances of thoſe times will enable it to bear.

Ahaz had interrupted the ſacrifices of atonement uſually offered up for *all Iſrael* in the temple at Jeruſalem, which was common to Jews and Iſraelites; and therefore

(15) "Dr. Kennicott's truly important work may, "*perhaps*, hereafter *ſtrengthen this conjecture.*" In a note, fo. 37.

therefore might truly be ſaid to *vex* the land of Iſrael as well as Judah: for he not only "*ſacrificed unto the gods of Da-*" *maſcus*," (2 Chron. xxviii. 23.) but he "cut in pieces the veſſels of the houſe "of God, and *ſhut up the doors of the* "*houſe of the Lord*" (24th verſe). King Hezekiah (16) (who opened again the doors of the houſe of the Lord, and cauſed the prieſts and Levites to cleanſe all the houſe from the abominations of Ahaz) was conſcious that his father, by the interruption of divine ſervice before-mentioned, had *vexed Iſrael* as well as Judah; and therefore made all the amends that lay in his power. He cauſed "*an atonement*" to be made "*for* "*all Iſrael:*" for the king "comman-"ded that the burnt-offering and the "ſin-offering ſhould be *made for all If-*" *rael.*" 2 Chron. xxix. 24.

He

(16) See 2 Chron. xxix.

He likewiſe " ſent to *all Iſrael* and " Judah, and wrote letters alſo to Ephra- " im and Manaſſeh, that they ſhould " come to the houſe of the Lord at Je- " ruſalem, to keep the paſſover unto the " Lord God *of Iſrael.*" 2 Chron. xxx. 1. And we read, in the 11th verſe of the ſame chapter, that " divers of Aſher and " Manaſſeh, and of Zebulun, humbled " themſelves (accordingly) and came " to Jeruſalem ;" and " *did eat the paſſ-* " *over.*" (See 18th verſe.) Now, as it appears that the *land of all the other Tribes*, as well as the *land of Judah*, was really vexed by the apoſtaſy of Ahaz, there is reaſon to ſuppoſe that *the land of Immanuel*, mentioned by Iſaiah (viii. 8.) might ſignify (not only *the land of Judah*, but) the land of *both the houſes* of *Iſrael*, שני בתי ישראל, mentioned in the 14th verſe of the ſame chapter ; and that the *two kings* of the land, mentioned in the

the ſeventh chapter, may mean the kings, or *ſeparate regal powers*, of theſe two houſes of Iſrael, which were *both to ceaſe before the child* (Immanuel) *ſhould know to refuſe the evil and chooſe the good.* The word מלך or king, in a figurative way of ſpeaking, may very well be underſtood in ſome paſſages (not to mean merely the perſon of one particular king, but in a more general ſenſe) to ſignify a *ſucceſſion of kings*, or rather *the regal conſtitution of a ſtate*; and the failure of ſuch royalty in ſome caſes ſerves as a diſtinguiſhing mark of conqueſt or ſubjection to a foreign power. "*The king ſhall* "*periſh from Gaza, and Aſhkelon ſhall not* "*be inhabited*," ſays the prophet Zechariah, (ix. 5.) by which is plainly underſtood (not the deſtruction of a ſingle king, but) the ceaſing of the regal government of the city of Gaza. It is a ſynonimous term with the *departing of the ſceptre*: "The pride of Aſſyria ſhall

"be

" be brought down, and *the ſceptre of* " *Egypt* ſhall depart away," ſays the ſame prophet in the 11th verſe of the ſucceeding chapter. The prophet Hoſea, likewiſe, uſes the word מלך in the ſame general ſenſe (xi. 5.) מלכו ואשור הוא — " the Aſſyrian (or Aſſur) ſhall be his " king:" *one Aſſyrian king only* cannot here be meant; but the ſucceſſion of kings reigning in Aſſyria during the captivity of Iſrael. Therefore, I preſume, there is ſome ground for my ſuppoſition, that Iſaiah's expreſſion in the ſeventh chapter, שני מלכיה, may ſignify *the two ſeparate regal governments* of Judah and Iſrael, (called, in the twenty-third chapter of Ezechiel, Aholah and Aholibah,) and not merely two ſingle kings.

When I firſt wrote this opinion, and communicated the MS. to Dr. W—ms, I apprehended that the thought was intirely new;—ſo little am I acquainted with the

 repub lic

republic of letters, for want of leiſure and opportunity to read! I muſt therefore acknowledge myſelf obliged to Dr. W—ms for his information, that the learned Mr. Mann, in his diſſertation De Anno natali Chriſti, "*appears to be of "the ſame opinion.*" I had likewiſe the ſatisfaction, afterwards, to be informed by another gentleman, (a worthy friend of mine,) that the ſame interpretation is recommended in the Univerſal Hiſtory, vol. IV. of the Octavo, p. 154, with the note K.

Now, that the opinion of the learned author may more clearly be underſtood, I will ſet down at length the whole that he wrote upon the text in queſtion.

Having mentioned the ſubject of Iſaiah's meſſage to Ahaz, he adds—"Here "the king, whether out of reſpect or deſ-"pondency and unbelief,—refuſing to aſk "the promiſed ſign, the prophet aſſured "him

" him from the Lord, that—before that " time came, a virgin ſhould conceive " and bear a ſon, and call his name Him- " manuel, or God with us; and ſo on." (K).

Upon this opinion he farther explains himſelf in the following note.

" (K) This we take to be a much " more natural ſenſe of that prophecy, " than to ſuppoſe, as ſome have done, " that ſuch a miraculous child was really " born in Ahaz's time, to aſſure him of " the promiſed deliverance; for, as there " is not the leaſt mention of ſuch an ex- " traordinary birth, ſo neither do we ſee " that there was any neceſſity for it, in " order to convince the deſponding king, " who could not be ignorant of that pro- " phecy of Jacob, that the ſceptre ſhould " not depart from Judah till Shiloh " was come, much leſs that he was to " ſpring of the lineage of David. But

" what ſtaggered Ahaz's faith, and made
" him fear that the regal power was go-
" ing to depart from his family, was,
" that his two enemies had combined to
" ſet a ſtranger on his throne. All,
" therefore, that was wanting to diſpel
" his preſent fears about it, was for the
" prophet to aſſure him from God, that
" this Shiloh, promiſed to Judah and
" David, who was to fore-run the total
" exciſion of the Jewiſh polity, was to be
" born in a miraculous manner and with
" a divine character, and other remark-
" able circumſtances, ſuch as, he might
" be eaſily ſatisfied, had not as yet hap-
" pened in his kingdom.

" As for that part of the prophecy
" which is commonly urged on the o-
" ther ſide, namely, " *Before this won-*
" *derful child ſhall know good from evil,*
" *the land which thou abhorreſt ſhall be*
" *forſaken of both her kings :*" We think
" that,

" that, if it be rightly underſtood, it will
" rather confirm our ſenſe of the prophe-
" cy, and that the words ought to be
" thus rendered. For (or rather, as the
" particle *chi* ſeems to import here, nay)
" before this child can know good from
" evil, this land, which thou (not ab-
" horreſt, as our verſion renders it, but)
" art ſo ſolicitous about, or giveſt up for
" loſt, ſhall be bereaved of both her
" kings; by which, we think, ought to
" be underſtood, not the kings of Syria
" and Iſrael, for the former could not be
" called her (Canaan's) king; and the
" latter had but a ſhare in it at beſt; *but*
" *the kings of Iſrael* and *Judah*, as it real-
" ly was before the coming of the Meſ-
" ſiah."

In order to confirm this opinion, I have annexed to theſe remarks two diſtinct diſſertations: one on the prophecy of Iſaiah vii. 8. (——" and within
" threeſcore

" threeſcore and five years ſhall Ephraim " be broken that it be not a people") ; and the other on the famous prophecy of Jacob, concerning the ſceptre of Judah.

In the former I ſhew, that the *regal government* of the *houſe of Iſrael*, as a ſeparate ſtate from Judah, was put an end to, not a great many years after Iſaiah's prophecy.

In the latter (I hope) I have proved that the regal government of the houſe of Judah (I mean only the temporal or worldly kingdom of Judah) ceaſed preciſely at the time limited by Iſaiah in the prophecy now before us. So that, I flatter myſelf, it will appear, upon the whole, that the land of Iſrael, including Judah (being the land which Ahaz *vexed)* was forſaken of " *both her kings*," or regal governments, before the child Immanuel could " *know to refuſe the evil and chooſe* " *the good*."

For,

For, Herod the Great, on a careful examination, (I believe) will be found to have been the laſt king of *the whole land* of *Iſrael and Judah*, which Ahaz *vexed*; and it is remarkable, that Chriſt, the true Immanuel, *was a young child in the arms of his mother* at the time of this monarch's death; ſoon after which, Joſeph, the huſband of the bleſſed virgin, was warned by an angel of the Lord in Egypt, ſaying, "Ariſe, and take THE YOUNG "CHILD and his mother, and go into "the *land of Iſrael*," (not the land of *Judah* only,) "for they are *dead* which "ſought the *young child*'s life." Mat. ii. 20.

But Dr W—ms in a note (page 32) obſerves, that the child Immanuel "*could* "*not be Chriſt*, becauſe *he is never called* "*the king of Judah.*" And he thinks that Nathaniel, when he called him *the king of Iſrael*, "*laboured* under the ſame "miſtake with all his countrymen, who "expected

" expected a temporal Meſſiah." The Doctor obſerves, in the ſame note, that " *Chriſt is king of the whole earth*;" which he ſeems to aſſign as a reaſon why " *he is never called the king of Judah.*"

And indeed it does not appear that the Doctor had any other foundation for his cenſure of Nathaniel; though this argument is ſo far from being concluſive in favour of the Doctor's opinion, that it rather proves the contrary; for he that is king of *the whole earth* muſt neceſſarily, in a general ſenſe, be king of Iſrael and Judah; theſe titles being moſt certainly included in the former, even ſuppoſing the peculiar ſceptre of each kingdom to be departed.

Nevertheleſs, the argument (ſuch as it is) is admitted and approved by the Critical Reviewers! for they quote the Doctor's words at length, (ſee N° 136, fo. 356.) without offering any thing to juſti-

fy

fy Nathaniel from the charge of *labouring under a miſtake*.

It ſhall therefore be my buſineſs to prove, that the miſtake does *not reſt with Nathaniel.*

Chriſt is, in a peculiar manner, eternal king of Judah and Iſrael, as well as king of the whole earth, and *heir of all things.* (Heb. i. 2.) The angel Gabriel teſtified that Chriſt ſhould *reign over the houſe of Jacob (which is Iſrael)* for ever. See St. Luke i. 32. And the wiſe men of the Eaſt *went to Jeruſalem* and inquired, "Where is he that *is born king of the* "*Jews?* for we have ſeen his ſtar in "the Eaſt, and come" (that is, to Jeruſalem, the capital of his kingdom) "*to* "*worſhip him.*" See Matth. ii. 1, 2. Therefore the Doctor's objection, that the child Immanuel could not be Chriſt *becauſe he is never called the king of Judah*, ſeems to be intirely groundleſs; for, the

dominion of the land of Immanuel (mentioned in the eighth chapter of Iſaiah) may moſt certainly be attributed with more propriety to the Meſſiah, who *was king* and *ſhepherd of Iſrael*, (ſee Ezek. xxxvii. 24. alſo xxxiv. 23, 24.) than to any ſon of Iſaiah whatever.

Dr. W—ms may, perhaps, ſuppoſe, that the kingdoms of Iſrael and Judah could not belong to Chriſt, becauſe he refuſed to accept of any temporal government, and withdrew himſelf when he perceived that the people would come, and take him by force to *make him a king*; (ſee John vi. 15.) and farther, becauſe he even declared that his kingdom was not of this world. See chap. xviii. 36. But all this ſeems to relate only to the manner of his government, which, in general, was merely ſpiritual. He was nevertheleſs *king of Iſrael*, being ſent in a particular manner to the loſt ſheep of the houſe

houſe of Iſrael; (ſee Matth. xv. 24.) and, for a time, Jeruſalem was *the ſeat of his kingdom*, when he went up to the feaſt; and a very great multitude ſpread their garments in the way, (a greater mark of ſubmiſſion than is ever paid to temporal princes,) and others cut down branches from the trees, and ſtrawed them in the way, (ſee Matth. xxi. 8.) and cried, *Hoſanna, Bleſſed is the* KING OF ISRAEL, that cometh in the name of the Lord. John xii. 13.

Chriſt did not tell the multitude that they "laboured *under a miſtake*" in calling him KING OF ISRAEL; on the contrary, it appears that he approved of the voice of the people; which could not have been the caſe, had he not been really *king of Iſrael:* for, when the Phariſees ſaid unto him, Maſter, rebuke thy diſciples, he anſwered and ſaid unto them, "I tell "you, that if theſe ſhould *hold their*

 "*peace*,

" *peace, the ſtones would immediately cry* " *out.*" Luke xix. 38, 39, 40. Thus was the Meſſiah not only " *called,*" *but proclaimed, king of Iſrael*; and as ſuch he received the homage of his people; yet, in ſuch a manner, as beſt ſuited the ſacred character of him, who had *rejected a worldly kingdom:* for, inſtead of royal apparel and a triumphal car, he was " *cloathed with humility,*" and ſitting on an aſs, that the prophecy of Zechariah might be literally fulfilled.

" Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; " ſhout, O daughter of Jeruſalem: be- " hold, THY KING cometh unto thee: " he is juſt, and having ſalvation, *lowly,* " and riding upon an aſs, and upon a colt " the foal of an aſs." (Zech. ix. 9.) But, though Chriſt profeſſed that his kingdom was not of this world, yet there was no worldly man hardy enough to reſiſt or oppoſe his will, when he was pleaſed

pleaſed to exert his divine authority over them; for, "he caſt out them that ſold "and bought in the temple, and over-"threw the tables of the money-changers, "and the ſeats of them that ſold doves; "and *would not ſuffer* that any man ſhould "carry any veſſel through the temple." Mark xi. 15, 16.

And St. John informs us (chap. ii. 15.) that he made a ſcourge of ſmall cords, and drove them all (all ſuch as are above mentioned) out of the temple.

Of all the extraordinary things which Chriſt did, St. Jerome thought this to be the moſt wonderful, as Mr. Bragge remarks in his Practical Obſervations upon the Miracles. This perſonal authority and dominion of Chriſt *in Iſrael* was expreſſly foretold by the prophet Micah, (ch. v. 2.) "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though "thou be little among the thouſands of "Judah, yet out of thee ſhall he come "forth

" forth unto me, that is to be RULER IN " ISRAEL; whoſe goings forth have been " from of old (17) from everlaſting." I never read any paſſage of Scripture which was capable of affording the leaſt countenance or ſupport to the contrary doctrine, that *Chriſt was not the king of Iſrael.* Indeed, the enemies and perſecutors of our Lord, at the time of his crucifixion, expreſſed their diſbelief of his being king of Iſrael (18), becauſe they did not think him to be the true anointed, or Meſſiah. Nevertheleſs, when the ſeveral extraordinary and miraculous circumſtances, relating to the birth, life, death, and perſecution, of that moſt holy perſon (Jeſus of Nazareth) are candidly examined and carefully compared

(17) " In the beginning was the Word, and the " Word was with God, and the Word was God. The " ſame was in the beginning with God." John i. 1.

(18) " If he be *the king of Iſrael*, (ſaid they,) let him " now come down from the croſs, and we will believe " him." Matth. xxvii. 42.

pared with the prophetical declarations concerning the promiſed Meſſiah, it manifeſtly appears, that there were very ſufficient reaſons for acknowledging that perſon to be both *Lord and Chriſt* (19); and conſequently "*king of Iſrael*," in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, not only during his bodily reſidence on earth, but to all eternity.

Wherefore,

(19) "Therefore let all the HOUSE *of Iſrael* know "aſſuredly, that God hath made *that ſame Jeſus whom* "*ye have crucified* both *Lord and Chriſt*." Acts ii. 36.

"And the angel ſaid unto them, (the ſhepherds,) "Fear not: for, behold, I bring unto you good tidings "of great joy, which ſhall be to all people. For, un- "to you is born this day, *in the city of David*, a ſavi- "our, *which is Chriſt the Lord*." Luke ii. 10, 11.

"The Word which God ſent unto the *children of Iſ-* "*rael*, preaching peace by Jeſus *Chriſt*, (*he is Lord* of "all)." Acts x. 36.

"—But we ſpeak the wiſdom of God in a myſtery, "(even) the hidden (wiſdom) which God ordained "before the world unto our glory. Which none of "the princes of this world knew; for had they known "(it) they would not have crucified the *Lord of glory*." 1 Corinth. ii. 7. 8.

"—That every tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus *Chriſt* "is *Lord*, to the glory of God the father." Philip. ii. 11.

Wherefore, we ought moſt certainly to acquit Nathaniel, and other faithful Iſraelites, of the *miſtake* which they have lately been ſuppoſed to "*labour under*," when they declared our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be "*the king of Iſrael.*" (John i. 49. xii. 13.)

Thus far have I ventured to ſuggeſt, in anſwer to Dr. W——ms's declaration in page 9,——that "the 16th verſe" (of the ſeventh chap. of Iſaiah) "*cannot in any ſenſe be applied to the Meſſiah:*" I hope I have proved that it may; nevertheleſs I muſt obſerve, that even the common interpretation of this paſſage is not ſo unreaſonable as Dr. W——ms ſeems to imagine; though, indeed, the interpretation before given appears to be much leſs liable to exception.

The Doctor animadverts very ſeverely on the opinion of thoſe, who ſay, that the paſſage contains two diſtinct prophecies;

cies ;—viz. that the verſes 14 and 15 relate to Chriſt, but the 16th to Iſaiah's ſon. " *Is not this* (ſays he) *very unna-* " *tural? and, if I am not miſtaken, very* " *unuſual?*"

But the authors of the old commentary on the Bible, commonly called Aſſemblies Annotations, were of a very different opinion.

They obſerve, on this very text, that " *it is an uſual thing* in Scripture, with " our prophet Iſaiah eſpecially, by way " of alluſion, to apply the ſame words " and phraſes unto divers ſubjects, where " occaſion is to ſpeak of them together :" and therefore they were of opinion, that the child mentioned in the 16th verſe was " no other, in all likelihood, than " Shearjaſhub, the prophet's child, " whom, to this purpoſe, God hath " commanded him to take along with

 " him."

" him." How far this was an uſual thing with Iſaiah, may be ſeen even in prophecies which were delivered on the ſame occaſion as the text in queſtion.

For the farther illuſtration of this point, I have added to my book a ſhort diſſertation on the nature and ſtyle of prophetical writings, ſhewing, that abrupt tranſitions from one ſubject to another are frequently found therein ; and that the Holy Scriptures afford many examples of prophecies, which are blended and interwoven with other ſubjects that are intirely different, both as to the matter and the time of accompliſhment.

We muſt not expect to find all prophecies unattended with difficulties : nevertheleſs, there are no difficulties in the ſeventh chapter of Iſaiah ſo great as thoſe, that are occaſioned by Dr. W——ms's interpretation of it. " This prophecy" (ſays he,)

he,) " as I take it, relates to *one perſon* " *only*, and that *was the ſon of a young* " *woman then preſent*; which ſon was af- " terwards to be born." See page 4.

Now I may aſk, with Origen, (20) contra Celſum, pag. 28, Cambridge edition, 1677,) — " Who was born in the " time of Ahaz, of whoſe birth this is " ſaid,— Emanuel? *that is*, GOD WITH " US. For, if no one is found, it is ma- " nifeſt, that what was ſaid of Ahaz " was addreſſed to *the houſe of* DAVID, " according to that which is written: — " *viz.*—of the *ſeed of David a Saviour is* " *born according to the fleſh.*"

Indeed, we read, in the eighth chapter, of a ſon, which the propheteſs con-

G 2 ceived

(20) " Απαιτησομεν κατα τες χρονες τε Αχαζ τις εγεννησεν, " εφ' ᾧ τη γενεσει λεγεται το, Εμμανουηλ, ὁ εστι Μεθ' ἡμων ὁ " Θεος; ει γαρ ουδεις ευρεθησεται, δηλον ὁτι το τω Αχαζ ειρη- " μενον, τῳ οικῳ ειρηται Δαβιδ, δια το εκ σπερματος Δαβιδ " αναγεγραφθαι τον Σωτηρα γεγονεναι το κατα σαρκα."

ceived and bare unto Iſaiah; and likewiſe, that Iſaiah was careful to take unto him FAITHFUL WITNESSES TO RECORD concerning him: "For, (ſaid he,) before the child ſhall have knowledge to cry, My father and my mother, (which muſt be within two years,) the RICHES of DAMASCUS and the SPOIL of SAMARIA ſhall be taken away before the king of Aſſyria." Therefore, this child was certainly the TEMPORARY SIGN of the promiſed deliverance from the *two powers* of DAMASCUS and SAMARIA: but, unfortunately for Dr. W——ms's hypotheſis, the ſaid child was NOT CALLED IMMANUEL, but MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ; מהר שלל חש בז properly ſignifying and prefiguring the *near approach of the ſpoiling of Damaſcus and Samaria.* Now, we do not read of any other child, born at that time as a ſign; and therefore Dr. W——ms's opinion, concerning Immanuel, is not only

only a *mere ſuppoſition*, but a very improbable one; ſince it is not at all likely that TWO CHILDREN were then born, one *Maher-ſhalal-haſh-baz*, and the other *Immanuel*, and both of them intended as MERE TEMPORARY SIGNS OF THE SAME THING.

The Doctor will find, on a farther examination of the text, that the birth of Iſaiah's ſon is only an *alluſion*, or *imperfect imitation*, of the former REMOTE SIGN, mentioned in the ſeventh chapter, (*viz.* of Immanuel's birth,) in the ſame manner as the *brazen ſerpent* (21), *lifted up*

(21) "And the Lord ſaid unto Moſes, Make thee "a fiery ſerpent, and ſet it upon a pole; and it ſhall "come to paſs, that every one that is bitten, when "he looketh upon it, ſhall live. And Moſes made a "ſerpent of braſs, and put it upon a pole; and it came "to paſs, that if a ſerpent had bitten any man, when "he beheld the *ſerpent of braſs*, he lived." Numb. xxi. 8, 9. — "And as Moſes lifted up THE SERPENT "in the wilderneſs, even ſo muſt THE SON OF MAN "BE LIFTED UP; that whoſoever believeth in him "SHOULD NOT PERISH, but have eternal life." John iii.

up in the wilderneſs, was an imperfect imitation, or type, of Chriſt crucified; and that the TEMPORARY DELIVERANCE from the *two kings* (of which the birth of Iſaiah's ſon was the TEMPORARY SIGN) cannot rightly be conſidered as the accompliſhment of the prophecy, but rather as a *confirmation* and *ſure pledge* of the ſaid REMOTE SIGN, as I have before obſerved.

" *But, when the* FULNESS OF TIME " *was come,*" the angel Gabriel was ſent from God to Nazareth, with a FARTHER REVELATION of the then approaching SIGN of the redemption promiſed by Iſaiah.

The *bleſſed virgin* anſwered, (Luke i. 34.) " *How ſhall this be, ſeeing I know* " *not a man?*"

That

iii. 14, 15. — See Mr. Cruden's excellent remarks on theſe texts, under the word SERPENT, in his Concordance.

That " *a woman ſhould compaſs a man*" (*viz.* conceive and bear a ſon without the knowledge of man) was an event ſcarcely to be expected or comprehended by man; it being the *new thing* which God had created in the earth, ſpoken of by the prophet Jeremiah xxxi. 22. (22) So that it was plainly the *ſeed of the woman* which bruiſed the ſerpent's head, as promiſed in Geneſis iii. 15. (23).

The occaſion of Iſaiah's prophecy, concerning the miraculous birth of Immanuel, is mentioned in the beginning of the ſeventh chapter. — " Becauſe Syria, " Ephraim, and the ſon of Remaliah, " have

(22) " How long wilt thou go about, O thou back- " ſliding daughter? (the virgin of Iſrael): for the " Lord hath created A NEW THING in the EARTH, a " WOMAN ſhall COMPASS A MAN." Jerem. xxxi. 22.

(23) " And I will put enmity between thee and the " woman, and between thy ſeed and HER SEED: IT " SHALL BRUISE THY HEAD, and thou ſhalt bruiſe " his heel." Gen. iii. 15.

" have taken evil counſel againſt thee,
" (Ahaz,) ſaying, Let us go up againſt
" Judah, and vex it; and let us make a
" breach therein for us, and *ſet* A KING
" IN THE MIDST OF IT, even the ſon
" of Tabeal." But " thus ſaith the Lord
" God, *It ſhall not ſtand, neither ſhall it*
" *come to paſs.*"

Now, this was a confirmation of the promiſe made by God to David, and delivered by Nathan the prophet, (2 Sam. vii. 16.) *viz.* " *Thine houſe* and *thy king-*
" *dom* ſhall be eſtabliſhed for ever before
" thee: THY THRONE ſhall be eſtabliſh-
" ed for EVER."

Therefore, as Juſtin Martyr obſerves (24), if the prophecy, " *Behold, a vir-*
" *gin*

(24) Κἀγω εφην, ω Τρυφων, ει μεν και την προφητειαν, ἡν εφη Ησαιας, ὁ φησι προς τον οικον τὸ Δαβιδ, Ιδὸ ἡ παρθενος εν γαστρι ληψεται, αλλα προς ἑτερον οικον των δωδεκα φυλων, ισως αν αποριαν ειχε το πραγμα· επειδὴ δε και αυτη ἡ προφητεια προς τον οικον Δαβιδ ειρηται, το ειρημενον προς Δαβιδ ὑπο Θεου εν μυστηριῳ, δια Ησαιου ὡς εμελλε γινεσθαι εξηγηθη. Juſtini Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, pag. 293, Paris Edition, 1636.

" *gin ſhall conceive*," had not been ſpoken to the houſe of David, but to any other houſe of the twelve tribes, the affair might have been doubtful; but the ſign was really given to the HOUSE OF DAVID; (ſee 13th verſe — " Hear ye " now, O houſe of David;") and, as no man was *ever born of a virgin* except the MESSIAH, who, on account of this birth, was called the SON OF DAVID, therefore it was ſurely the propereſt ſign that could be given, to aſſure them that the *houſe* and the KINGDOM of DAVID *ſhould be eſtabliſhed for ever*, and that the evil counſel of Syria and Ephraim ſhould not ſtand. The houſe and the kingdom of David cannot be eſtabliſhed FOR EVER, in the perſon of any of David's deſcendants, except the Meſſiah himſelf; for (with reſpect to the preſent times) the worldly kingdom of David ceaſed very many ages ago, and his people, the children of Iſrael, being moſt

 deſervedly

deſervedly ejected (on account of their wickedneſs and unbelief) from their old inheritance, the land of Canaan, have never ſince obtained any other as a poſſeſſion, but, for near ſeventeen hundred years, have been diſperſed throughout the whole world: and yet, by the manifeſt providence (25) of God, they remain, to this day, in the *midſt of all nations*, a *diſtinct* and *peculiar people*; ſo that their preſent ſtate is an authentic and undeniable voucher of the truth of the Holy Scriptures (26), and themſelves a living teſtimony

(25) See biſhop Newton's Diſſertation on the Prophecies, 1ſt vol. p. 215 to 238, where that learned author treats very fully and pathetically concerning the remarkable providence of God in the preſervation of the Jews.

(26) "What is occaſionally ſaid, by Moſes and "other prophets, concerning the future ſtate of God's "people, the Jews, is, alone, ſufficient to eſtabliſh "the divine authority of the holy writings. The pro-"miſes made to them are literally fulfilled, the ven-"geance denounced againſt them is literally inflicted. "Captives they were frequently made; wanderers "they became; and ſuch they continue to be at this "day,

teſtimony of God's juſt judgement, *which they ſtill lie under, until they ſhall repent.*

But Chriſt's *ſpiritual kingdom of Iſrael*, into which we are adopted, is everlaſting; and the prophet Iſaiah gave Ahaz, and his cotemporaries of *the houſe of David*, the ſtrongeſt aſſurances that it ſhould be ſo. — " *Of the increaſe of his government* " *and peace*" (ſays he, in the ninth chapter, which I have already ſhewn to have been delivered nearly at the ſame time with the ſeventh chapter) " *there ſhall* " *be* NO END, *upon the throne of David,* " *and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to* " *eſtabliſh it with judgement and with juſ-* " *tice*, from henceforth even for ever :

 " the

" day, ſojourning in the midſt of all nations, united " with none; peculiars every where, and by no hu- " man means to be again conſolidated : *which is alto-* " *gether as wonderful as if the waters of any one parti-* " *cular river ſhould remain in diſtinct globules, though* " *ſcattered through the whole ocean.*" Dr. Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity, &c. pag. 4 and 5.

" the zeal of the Lord of hoſts will per-
" form this."

In page 37, Dr. W——ms ſays, " The laſt objection which I know, that " can be made to my ſenſe of the paſ- " ſage, is, that it is utterly inconſiſtent " with the words of St. Matthew, chap. " i. 22, 23."

Here I muſt intirely agree with the Dr. though I am not the better ſatisfied with his hypotheſis.

Now, that we may thoroughly under-ſtand the text in queſtion, it will be neceſſary to conſider St. Matthew's application of it.

He informs us, that " the birth of " Jeſus Chriſt was on this wiſe: When, " as his mother Mary was eſpouſed to " Joſeph, before they came together, " ſhe

" ſhe was found with *child of the Holy*
" *Ghoſt*, then Joſeph, her huſband, be-
" ing a juſt man, and not willing to make
" her a public example, was minded to
" put her away privily. But, while he
" thought on theſe things, behold, the
" *angel of the Lord* appeared unto him in
" a dream, ſaying, Joſeph, THOU SON
" OF DAVID, fear not to take unto thee
" Mary, thy wife; for *that which is con-*
" *ceived in her* IS OF THE HOLY GHOST:
" and ſhe ſhall bring forth a ſon, and
" thou ſhalt call his name Jeſus, (ישוע):
" for he ſhall *ſave his people* from their
" ſins. NOW ALL THIS *was done, that*
" *it might be fulfilled* which was
" ſpoken of the Lord by the pro-
" phet, ſaying, Behold, A VIRGIN ſhall
" be with child, and ſhall bring forth a
" ſon, and they ſhall call his name EM-
" MANUEL, which, being interpreted, is,
" *God with us.*" Now, Dr. W——ms
hopes to excuſe himſelf and his hypothe-

ſis

ſis by alledging, (ſee page 40,) that this is only "*an accommodation* (by way of *il-*
"*luſtration*, not proof) of a paſſage to
"a particular ſenſe, to which it *origi-*
"*nally had no reference.*"

But ſhould we not ſeem to pay very little regard to Goſpel teſtimony, (I now ſpeak as to Chriſtians,) if we were to ſuppoſe, that the prophecy *originally had no reference* to this event, when an apoſtle *expreſſly affirms* that it had?

Might not Dr. Doddridge's obſervation (quoted in page 38 of the Crit. Diſſert.) be then, with more juſtice, urged againſt us? *viz.* "This way of
"proceeding will make the Scriptures
"the moſt uncertain writings in the
"world." But now let us ſee how this notion of *an accommodation* will ſuit with the reſt of the Doctor's hypotheſis.

He

He ſays, (page 44,) "I think that "the prophet had *no reference to the Meſ-* "*ſiah*, and that the evangeliſt only al- "ludes to this paſſage in Iſaiah, becauſe "it was *remarkably ſuitable* to the matter "which he was relating." Now the Dr. ſeems to have forgot his former opinion, in page 23, *viz.* "that the word עלמה "doth not appear to *ſignify ſtrictly a* "*virgin.*"

For, if this were true, that עלמה doth not ſignify a virgin, in what ſenſe could the text be eſteemed *remarkably ſuitable* to the miraculous conception of a VIRGIN by the HOLY GHOST? And in what manner could the *accommodation of it* to that *ſingular event* aſſiſt the ſacred hiſtorian "BY WAY OF ILLUSTRATION"? (See page 40.)

Nay, the Doctor has even taken great pains to render the text REMARKABLY UN-

UNSUITABLE! for he would have us underſtand that העלמה the YOUNG WOMAN, (as he conſtrues it,) ſpoken of in the text, was ſo *far from being a* VIRGIN that ſhe was with child ("IS CONCEIVING and BEARING a SON," ſays he, in page 37) even at the time when ſhe was pointed at (as he ſuppoſes, in page 31) by the prophet. Theſe words (*viz.* "IS CONCEIVING and BEARING a SON") are a part of what he has given us, in page 37, as a "*literal tranſlation* of the "original;" but it is ſo far from being ſo, that the true ſenſe of *the letter*, or text, ſeems to be exchanged for that of the interlineary verſion of the London Polyglot, which renders it "*prægnans & pariens.*"

But the words הרה וילדה are not participles active, but are in the perfect tenſe; yet there needs no apology for the Septuagint and other tranſlations in rendering them as if they were of the *future* tenſe,

tenſe, becauſe the ſentence, to which they belong, is plainly the prediction of a *future* event (27): for, in prophetical writings, the perfect is frequently uſed for the *future* tenſe. "Apud prophetas "autem creberrime (præteritum) pro "futuro uſurpatur, quo res certò futûra "ſignificetur, perinde ac ſi jam eveniſ- "ſet: ut puer ילד natus eſt nobis, pro "naſcetur." BYTHNER. Inſtitutio Linguæ Sanctæ, p. 10. Dr. W——ms's *literal tranſlation* (as he calls it) of the *perfect* tenſe into the *participle* active cannot (I believe) be ſo eaſily vindicated.

Would it not be very unnatural to ſuppoſe, that the prophets have been intirely ſilent concerning this moſt remarkable ſign of the Meſſiah, (*viz.* his being BORN

(27) — "It is a well known obſervation, of the "Chriſtian and Jewiſh doctors, that the prophet, ſee- "ing in his mind's eye the events he foretels, often "ſpeaks of them as already paſt." *Dr. Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity*, p. 309. — In a note.

OF A VIRGIN,) inſomuch, that an evangeliſt ſhould be obliged to ACCOMMODATE, to this *ſingular circumſtance*, a paſſage, which, originally, had "*no re-* "*ference to* THE MESSIAH?" And that he ſhould attempt to paſs ſuch a MERE ACCOMMODATION upon the world for the genuine ſenſe of the prophet, by ſignifying, in the ſtrongeſt terms, that this text was *fulfilled* by the circumſtances which he there relates?

The evangeliſt thus expreſſes himſelf: "Now, ALL THIS WAS DONE, that it "*might be fulfilled* which was ſpoken of "the Lord by the prophet," &c. τυτο δε ὁλον γεγονεν ἱνα πληρωθη το ῥηθεν ὑπο τυ κυριυ δια τυ προφητυ λεγοντος, &c. Which implies, that, if ALL THIS had not come to paſs, the *word of the Lord, by the prophet*, would not have *been fulfilled:* therefore, this caſe is by no means ſimilar to the inſtances of ACCOMMODATION drawn from

from the GRECIAN POETS (28), in page 41.

But why ſhould any one attempt, now-a-days, to explain away the genuine meaning of a prophecy, *ſo literally fulfilled* by the miraculous birth of Chriſt, when even *the Jewiſh interpreters*, near 300 years (*i. e.* according to the Chronicon of Euſebius, 279 years) before that wonderful event, had conſtrued the ſame prophecy in ſuch a manner, that it could not poſſibly be applied to any perſon whatſoever except the promiſed Meſſiah, who ALONE WAS BORN OF A VIRGIN?

This teſtimony of the Septuagint was taken notice of by Origen, (contra Cel-

 ſum

(28) The learned author, whom Dr. W.——ms has quoted in page 41, has made a very neceſſary reſerve on this head, which the Doctor has omitted in his quotation: *viz.* "But, indeed, to an attentive "mind, the difference will appear very great between "the citations from prophane authors and the pro-"phets."

ſum (29), p. 27,) and is certainly of greater authority, in favour of the true ſenſe of the word העלמה (rendered by them παρθενος, *a virgin,*) than any thing that Dr. W——ms has offered againſt it.

It is remarkable, that all the ancient MSS. of the Septuagint, in different parts of the world, teſtify the truth of this reading; of which four, in particular, are of conſiderable authority, on account of their very great antiquity; *viz.* the Vatican, Alexandrian, Complutenſian, and Venetian, MSS. And, though many copies of the Septuagint muſt have been in the hands of Jews, as well as others, both before and after the birth of Chriſt, yet

(29) Εαν δε Ιουδαιος ευρεσιλογων, το Ιδου ἡ παρθενος, μη γεγραφθαι λεγει, αλλ' αντ' αυτου, Ιδου ἡ νεανις· φησομεν προς αυτον, ὁτι ἡ μεν λεξις ἡ Αλμα, ἡν οἱ μεν ἑβδομηκοντα μετειληφασι προς την παρθενον, &c. Quod ſi Judæus, vocabula excutiens, neget ſcriptum, *Ecce virginem*, ſed *Ecce adoleſcentula*, dicêmus ibi legi vocem ALMA, quam Septuaginta interpretes verterunt virginem, &c. Cambridge edition, 1677, p. 27.

yet I never heard that any perſon ever produced a copy which contradicted this original reading; for, as the Septuagint was the common tranſlation uſed in the ſynagogues, throughout all Aſia, Greece, and Egypt, (ſee biſhop Walton's Prolegomena ix. p. 60. N°. 15,) any alteration, in ſo remarkable a text as this, would very ſoon have been diſcovered.

And it muſt alſo be remembered, that the ſeveral Greek tranſlations, wherein the word העלמה is rendered *νεανις*, *a young woman*, (*viz.* that of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus,) were all made *after the birth of Chriſt*, when the unbelieving Jews were deſirous of perverting the true meaning of the prophecy.

The ancient Syriac verſion expreſſes העלמה by the very word (*viz.* ܥܠܡܬܐ from בתולה) which the Doctor ſets up in oppoſition to it; and which, he juſtly obſerves,

obſerves, muſt ſignify ſtrictly a VIRGIN (30). And, laſtly, St. Matthew, whether he quoted the original or Septuagint, was certainly convinced that the true ſenſe of the word was παρθενος, a VIRGIN, and he hath accordingly left us his teſtimony of it; which proves, that the Doctor's application of this word, *to the mother of Iſaiah's ſon*, muſt be very erroneous.

The child, *Immanuel*, could not be Iſaiah's ſon, becauſe it appears, from ſo many undeniable teſtimonies, that his *mother* was to be really *a virgin*; and becauſe *the event itſelf* (by which the prophecy is beſt underſtood) has proved this truth beyond all contradiction.

Wherefore,

(30) The Rabbins always by בתולה mean a *virgin:* that they well underſtand their own language cannot be denied, &c. p. 20. — See alſo p. 25, where, ſpeaking of the Septuagint tranſlation of Eſther ii. 2. he adds, "*whence it muſt undeniably appear, that they* "*underſtood* בתולה *to mean* A VIRGIN, *in the ſtricteſt* "*ſenſe of the word.*"

Wherefore, I think I may now ſafely conclude, in Dr. W——ms's own words, before quoted, that his opinion, concerning this text, " IS UTTERLY IN-" CONSISTENT WITH THE WORDS OF " ST. MATTHEW," and, of courſe, that the Doctor is *indiſpenſably bound* to yield up his hypotheſis to the *ſuperior authority of the evangeliſt.*

The END *of* PART I.

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

NATURE AND STYLE

OF

PROPHETICAL WRITINGS:

SHEWING

That abrupt Tranſitions, from one Subject to another, are frequently found therein.

The ſame being intended to illuſtrate the foregoing Remarks on the Critical Diſſertation, &c.

A

DISSERTATION

ON THE

NATURE and STYLE

OF

PROPHETICAL WRITINGS, &c.

THE prophecies, contained in the ſeventh, eighth, and ninth, chapters of Iſaiah, ſeem to have been delivered during the general conſternation of the houſe of David, occaſioned by the invaſion of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Iſrael; becauſe ſeveral circumſtances, relating to the ſaid kings and their reſpective nations, are

mentioned in each of theſe chapters (1); notwithſtanding that the ſame chapters contain prophecies of very diſtant events, which are ſo blended with the tranſactions of the (then) preſent times, that it would not be eaſy to diſtinguiſh the real difference, in point of chronology, if the apparent accompliſhment of theſe ſeveral prophecies did not remove the difficulty. Rezin and Pekah are both particularly mentioned in the 7th chapter, wherein the extraordinary birth of the *child Immanuel* is given as a ſign. The ſpoiling of their reſpective cities is promiſed in the 8th chapter (2), wherein the birth of the child

(1) Septimum, octavum, et nonum, Iſaiæ caput in eodem fere verſantur argumento, &c. *P. D. Huetii Demonſtratio Evangelica*, p. 291.

(2) "For, before the child *(Maher-ſhalal-haſh-baz)* ſhall have knowledge to cry, My father and my mother, the *riches of Damaſcus* and the *ſpoil of Samaria* ſhall be taken away before the king of Aſſyria." viii. 4. "Foraſmuch as this people refuſeth the waters of Shiloah, that go ſoftly, and rejoice in *Rezin* and *Remaliah's ſon*; now, therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth upon them the

child Maher-ſhalal-haſh-baz, the ſon of Iſaiah, is foretold, as the temporary ſign of the ſame: and, notwithſtanding that the greateſt part of the ſaid chapter relates to thoſe times, yet the prophet introduces, in the very midſt of it, a plain reference to the times of the Meſſiah; ſee 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th, verſes, which ſhall be hereafter conſidered. In the 9th chapter, the *preſumption of Ephraim* and the inhabitants of Samaria (3) is reproved, and God's judgements are once more expreſſly denounced *againſt Rezin*, as if theſe

the waters of the river, ſtrong and many, even the king of *Aſſyria*," &c. — " And the ſtretching out of his wings ſhall fill the breadth of thy land, *O Immanuel.*" viii. 6, 7, 8.

(3) " And all the people ſhall know, even *Ephraim* and the inhabitants of *Samaria*, that ſay, in the pride and ſtoutneſs of heart, The bricks are fallen down, but we will build with hewen ſtones," &c. ix. 9, 10. " Therefore the Lord ſhall ſet up the adverſaries of *Rezin* againſt him," &c. ix. 11. Theſe three verſes, 9th, 10th, and 11th, and alſo the 21ſt, plainly allude to the ſubject of the 7th chapter, *viz.* the evil counſel and confederacy of *Syria* and *Ephraim*, and God's promiſe that the ſame ſhould not ſtand.

theſe things were to happen after the birth of the *child* that was to "be called "*Wonderful, Counſellor, the mighty God,* "*the everlaſting Father, the Prince of* "*peace,* of the increaſe of *whoſe govern-* "*ment and peace* there ſhould be *no end,* "upon the throne of David and upon "his kingdom," *&c.* For the birth of this divine perſon is foretold in the former part of the ſame chapter; and yet I never heard of an attempt to apply this prophecy to a ſon of Iſaiah, or to any other child born about that time.

In the beginning of this 9th chapter, the prophet alludes likewiſe to ſome other hiſtorical circumſtances, beſides what are already mentioned concerning Syria and Ephraim; and theſe had either then lately happened, or were very ſhortly to come to paſs, notwithſtanding that the alluſion is blended with a very diſtant prophecy concerning the preaching of Chriſt.

The

The circumſtances, which I ſpeak of, are the Aſſyrian conqueſt and captivity of *Zebulun* and *Napthali*, which happened in the days of Pekah, king of Iſrael (4). This was the affliction (5) *by the* "*way of the ſea, beyond Jordan, in Ga-*" *lilee*, of the nations," mentioned by Iſaiah, ix. 1. by which he expreſſly points out the very ſpot, *Galilee*, where *Immanuel* was chiefly to be manifeſted by his mighty deeds and miracles; for the prophet immediately proceeds, verſe 2. "The people (ſays he) *that walked in* "*darkneſs*

(4) "In the days of Pekah, king of Iſrael, came Tiglathpileſer, king of Aſſyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maa-chah, and Janoah, and Kedeſh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and *Galilee*, all the land of Napthali, and carried them captive to Aſſyria." 2 *Kings* xv. 29.

(5) "Nevertheleſs, the dimneſs ſhall not be ſuch as was in her vexation, when at the firſt he lightly afflicted the land of *Zebulun*, and the land of *Napthali*, and afterward did more grievouſly afflict her, by the way of the ſea, beyond Jordan, in *Galilee*, of the nations." *Iſaiah* ix. 1. "The people that walked in darkneſs have ſeen a great light," *&c.* ix. 2.

" *darkneſs* (6) *have ſeen a great light:* " they that dwell in the land of the ſha- " dow of death, upon *them hath the light* " *ſhined.*" And afterwards, in the 6th verſe, he renews the ſame promiſes, given in the 7th chapter, concerning the *birth of a divine child*, whoſe attributes and dignity are here ſo fully expreſſed, by the prophet, that they can by no means agree with the character *of any other child* but that which was truly *Immanuel*, or, *God with us.* Therefore, it is plain, that the prophecies of the 8th and 9th chapters were delivered nearly at the ſame time with thoſe of the 7th chapter, which are farther explained and

(6) This correſponds with the prejudice which the Jews conceived againſt their brethren the Galilæans. The chief Prieſts and Phariſees anſwered Nicodemus, ſaying, " Search and look; for out of *Galilee* ariſeth *no prophet.*" *John* vii. 52. In like manner anſwered Nathaniel, when Philip told him, " We have found him of whom Moſes, in the law, and the Prophets, did write, *Jeſus* of Nazareth, the ſon of Joſeph." And Nathaniel ſaid unto him, *Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?* John i. 45, 46.

and confirmed thereby; ſo that, if Dr. W——ms will carefully examine all theſe three chapters, he will find, that it is *not unuſual* (7), in prophetic writings, to make quick and abrupt tranſitions from one ſubject to another, *nor unnatural*, that a very diſtant prophecy ſhould be blended with others that were ſoon to be accompliſhed; becauſe it *is the nature of prophecy* to be delivered in this myſterious manner. For (ſays Iſaiah, xxviii. 10.) "precept muſt be (or hath been) upon "precept, precept upon precept, line upon

(7) See Dr. W——ms's comment on the opinion of thoſe who ſay that the 14th, 15th, and 16th, verſes of the viiith chap. of *Iſaiah* contain two diſtinct prophecies. "Is not this (ſays he) *very unnatural?* and, if I am not greatly miſtaken, *very unuſual?*" p. 9.

But an experienced writer, who, on many occaſions, has given ample proofs of great learning and ſcripture-knowledge, informs us, that "it is *very natural* and "*very uſual*, with the prophets, to make *a tranſition* "*from one great deliverance to another, as alſo from one* "*great deſtruction to another:*" — and he afterwards gives ſeveral remarkable inſtances of it. See Dr. *Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity*, p. 255.

" on line, line upon line, *here a little*
" and *there a little.* For with ſtammer-
" ing lips and another tongue will he
" ſpeak (or he hath ſpoken) to this peo-
" ple." And again, in the 13th verſe,
" *here a little and there a little*; that they
" might go and fall backward, and be
" broken, and ſnared, and taken." The nature and reaſon of typical writings are ſtrongly expreſſed in St. Mark's Goſpel (8), iv. 11, 12, 13. Wherefore, it is our duty to aſk God's aſſiſtance, when we read the ſcriptures, that we may underſtand them to our comfort, leſt they ſhould be a ſtumbling-block to us, as they

(8) " And, when he (Jeſus) was alone, they that were about him with the twelve aſked of him the parable. And he ſaid unto them, Unto you it is given to know the myſtery of the kingdom of God; but, *unto them that are without, all theſe things are done in parables*; that, ſeeing, they may ſee and *not perceive*; and, hearing, they may hear and *not underſtand*; leſt at any time they ſhould be converted, and their ſins ſhould be forgiven them. And he ſaid unto them, know ye not this parable? and how then will you know all parables? The ſower ſoweth," &c. Mark iv. 10—13.

they were to the unbelieving Jews. But not only the ſcriptures, even Chriſt himſelf, became a ſtone of ſtumbling to the Jews: for, about the time of his coming, they univerſally expected a glorious and triumphant Meſſiah to rule over them; inſomuch, that Herod the Great was exceedingly alarmed with the apprehenſion of ſo powerful a competitor *for the throne of David.* But, when "*the deſire of all* "*nations*" (ſee Haggai ii. 7.) was really come, his humble appearance, meekneſs, and diſintereſted, *though intereſting*, doctrine, did not in the leaſt correſpond with their worldly imaginations; ſo that "*he* "*was in the world, and the world was* "*made by him, and the world knew him* "*not: he came unto his own, and his own* "*received him not.*" John i. 10, 11. For the Jews did not then conſider (any more than they do at preſent) that the humility of the Meſſiah was as expreſſly foretold by the prophets as his glory.

" *Who hath believed our report?*" ſays Iſaiah, in chap. liii. when he is about to deſcribe the humility, afflictions, and death, of the Meſſiah. " He hath no " form nor comelineſs; and, when we " ſhall ſee him, there is no beauty that " we ſhould deſire him: *he is deſpiſed* " *and rejected of men*," *&c.* See the whole chapter (9).

The Jews could not reconcile this unexpected *humility* with that glorious character which they ſo long looked for and deſired, *viz.* " *a king that ſhould reign* " *and proſper*;" whom " *the Lord*" (Jehovah)

(9) " Who can read this oracle and not allow Iſaiah " to have been, what he is ſometimes called, the " Evangelical Prophet? Is not this prophecy, in eve- " ry part, as applicable to Jeſus as is the account gi- " ven of him by the holy Evangeliſts? Could it have " been expreſſed in ſtronger or clearer terms if written " after the event? And yet it was delivered above 700 " years before the birth of Jeſus." Dr. *Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity*, p. 232.

hovah) promiſed by Jeremiah (10) to "*raiſe up unto David,*" and who is likewiſe

(10) "Behold the days come, ſaith the Lord, (יהוה *Jehovah,*) that I will raiſe unto David a righteous branch, and *a king ſhall reign and proſper*, and ſhall execute judgement and juſtice in the earth. In his days *Judah* ſhall be ſaved, and Iſrael ſhall dwell ſafely: and this is his name whereby he ſhall be called, *The Lord (Jehovah* יהוה*) our righteouſneſs.*" Jeremiah xxiii. 5, 6. See alſo xxxiii. 16. — Where the ſame title (יהוה) is given to the Branch of righteouſneſs mentioned in the preceding verſe. — Compare with theſe chap. xxx. 9. — "And they ſhall ſerve the *Lord their God* (יהוה אלהיהם) and *David their king*," (ואת דוד מלכם) "whom I will raiſe up unto them." — The comparing of theſe texts together has occaſioned the following remark, which I find wrote with a pencil in the margin of my Hebrew Bible, I ſuppoſe, by ſome former owner of it. "Meſſias vocabitur David ſecundum carnem, *Jova* ſecundum divinitatem." — *i. e.* "Chriſt ſhall be called *David* "with reſpect to his human nature, and *Jehovah* with "reſpect to his divinity." — The divinity of the Meſſiah may be clearly proved, by a multitude of other paſſages, even in the Old Teſtament. Therefore, it behoves *the authors of the Critical Review* ſeriouſly to conſider how thoſe men can be juſtified who refuſe the Son of God the honour due unto his name; ſince "*the Father hath committed all judgement unto the Son, that all men ſhould honour the Son even as they honour the Father.*" John v. 22, 23.

wiſe called (as a name the moſt ſuitable to the only begotten Son of God) "*the* "*Lord*" (Jehovah) "*our righteouſneſs.*" This unfortunate miſapprehenſion was plainly foretold by Iſaiah, when he warned the people to "*ſanctify the Lord of* "*hoſts himſelf,*" (יהוה צבאות אתו תקדישו את); and (ſays he) "*let him be your* "*fear, and let him be your dread.*" Now, what perſon could the prophet mean by this glorious title (יהוה צבאות *Jehovah Sabaoth)* if not the Meſſiah? for he immediately adds, "and he ſhall be "for a ſanctuary, *but* (or, rather, *and)* "for a ſtone of ſtumbling, and for a "rock of offence, to both the houſes of "Iſrael, for a *gin* and for a *ſnare* to the "inhabitants

A doctrine very oppoſite to this is approved and commended in the 10th article of the *Critical Review for May*, 1760; whereby it appears that the author or authors of that recommendatory criticiſm were not ſufficiently armed againſt the dangerous and pernicious doctrines of the book which they undertook to recommend, *viz. The Trinitarian Controverſy reviewed*; *or a Defence of the Appeal to the Common-Senſe of all Chriſtian People.*

" inhabitants of Jeruſalem. And many
" among them ſhall *ſtumble and fall*, and
" *be broken*, and *be ſnared*, and *be taken*.
" Bind up the *teſtimony*, ſeal the law *a-*
" *mong my diſciples*." Iſaiah 13—16.

We have the teſtimony of St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Romans, ix. 33. (11), that this text *relates to Chriſt*; for he has there blended a part of it with another quotation from Iſaiah xxviii. 16. (12). St. Peter

(11) —— " for they *ſtumbled* at that *ſtumbling-ſtone*;
" as it is written, Behold, I lay in Sion a *ſtumbling*
" *ſtone* and *rock of offence*: and whoſoever believeth on
" *him ſhall not be aſhamed*." Rom. ix. 32, 33.

(12) " Therefore, thus ſaith the Lord God, Behold,
" I lay in Zion, for a foundation, a *ſtone*, a *tried ſtone*,
" a precious *corner ſtone*, a ſure foundation: he that
" believeth ſhall not *make haſte*," (לא יחיש) that is, he ſhall not be ſubject to that kind *of haſte* which is commonly the effect *of fear*. Therefore the Syriac verſion has rendered it ܢܕܚܠ *ſhall not be afraid*; which is very expreſſive of the Prophet's meaning. The LXX have rendered it ὁ μη καταισχυνθη; and St. Paul, ὁ καταισχυνθησεται, that is, *ſhall not be aſhamed*; which is ſtill more expreſſive of a man's being free from that *haſte* or confuſion cauſed by fear. *Not to be aſhamed* is

Peter likewiſe quotes it, in his firſt Epiſtle, ii. 8. (13), and applies it to Chriſt. And indeed it can mean no other than "*Chriſt crucified*," who (as St. Paul informs us) was "to the Jews *a ſtumbling* "*block*, and unto the Greeks fooliſhneſs." 1 Cor. i. 23. But, notwithſtanding theſe plain teſtimonies, Dr. W——ms is of a very different opinion. "*Iſaiah does not* "*ſeem*" (ſays the Dr. in a note, p. 32) "*to ſpeak of the Meſſiah till the* ixth *chap-* "*ter.*" But, though the Dr. here allows that the ixth chapter contains a prophecy concerning the Meſſiah, yet, perhaps, he is not aware, that, if his reaſons againſt the common interpretation of the viith chapter

is frequently put for *not to fear*. They ſhall *not be aſhamed* in the *evil time*, ſays the Pſalmiſt, xxxvii. 19. and again — they ſhall *not be aſhamed*, but they ſhall ſpeak with the enemies in the gate. Pſalm cxxvii. 5.

This I hope is ſufficient to reconcile the ſeeming diſagreement between the original and St. Paul's quotation.

(13) "And a *ſtone of ſtumbling, and a rock of offence*, "even to them which *ſtumble* at the word, being diſo- "bedient, whereunto alſo they were appointed."

chapter (on account of " *the preſent order,* " *and abrupt tranſition,*" which he complains of in p. 10) *were at all concluſive,* the ſame would hold good likewiſe againſt the common interpretation of this ixth chapter; wherein the *tranſitions* from one ſubject to another are equally *abrupt*, and the remote events, concerning the *birth* and *preaching* of the Meſſiah, are foretold, even before other events, " *which* " *were immediately, or very ſhortly, to* " *happen.*" (See p. 9.)

The Dr. may be right enough in his obſervation, that there are no inſtances " of *remote ſigns* to prove the accompliſh- " ment of an event near at hand:" (ſee pages 9 and 10.) But it is plainly his own miſtake which cauſes the difficulty that he ſpeaks of; for the ſign, given by Iſaiah, of the birth of *Immanuel*, (*viz.* behold, a virgin ſhall conceive, &c.) was not a remote ſign of *an event near at hand*,

(as the Dr. ſuppoſes,) but a *remote ſign* of *a remote event*, and therefore not liable to his cenſure.

The holy ſcriptures afford a great many other examples of prophecies which are blended and interwoven with very different ſubjects; different, I ſay, both with reſpect to the matter and the time of accompliſhment.

There are alſo many inſtances of paſſages which bear a double conſtruction, being partly applicable to ſome particular perſon, expreſſly mentioned, though they ultimately and chiefly relate to another very different perſon.

The prophecy of Nathan, concerning Solomon, is of this kind. " He ſhall " build an houſe for my name, and I will " eſtabliſh the throne of his kingdom for " ever. I will be his father, and he " ſhall

" ſhall be my ſon." 2 Sam. vii. 13, 14. King David himſelf explained this more particularly to his ſon Solomon, and applied it to him, 1 Chron. xxii. 9. ſaying, " for his name ſhall be *Solomon*," (ſee the margin שלמה " *peaceable*," agreeable to Chriſt's title, mentioned in the ixth chapter of Iſaiah, *viz.* שר שלום Prince of *peace,)* " and I will give *peace* and " *quietneſs* unto Iſrael in his days. He " ſhall build an houſe for my name, and " he ſhall be *my ſon*, and I will be *his fa-* " *ther*, and I will eſtabliſh the throne of " his kingdom over Iſrael *for ever*." But where has the throne of Solomon been eſtabliſhed, for near 1800 years laſt paſt, if not in *Jeſus Chriſt*, the ſpiritual *Solomon* and *prince of peace?* For, though this prophecy plainly related to Solomon, yet it referred to a farther accompliſhment in the Meſſiah, by whom alone it could be perfectly fulfilled; and therefore a part of it is applied immediately to

Chriſt, by St. Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Hebrews, i. 5. "I will be to him a "*father*, and he ſhall be to me a *ſon*."

Of the ſame kind is the lxxiid pſalm, dedicated to *Solomon*. "They ſhall fear "*thee* as long as *the ſun and moon endure*, "*throughout all generations*." This is, indeed, applied to *Solomon*; but, as the reign of that monarch was merely *temporal*, the prophecy cannot be ſaid to be fulfilled in any other perſon beſides the Meſſiah himſelf, the true שלמה (Solomon) who *reigns*, according to the Pſalmiſt's expreſſion, "*throughout all genera-* "*tions*."

The prophet Haggai, chap. ii. promiſes *Zerubbabel, governor of Judah*, and *Joſhua, the high-prieſt*, in the name of *the Lord of hoſts*, that "*the deſire of all* "*nations ſhall come*," and that he (the Lord of hoſts) "*will fill this houſe*" (that is,

is, the houſe which they were ordered to build) " with glory." v. 7. And he adds, in the 9th verſe, " The glory of " this latter houſe ſhall be greater than " of the former, ſaith the Lord of hoſts: " and in this place will I give *peace* " (אתן שלום) ſaith the Lord of hoſts."

Nevertheleſs, in the former part of the ſame chapter, the prophet appeals to thoſe who had ſeen the " houſe in her " firſt glory. And how (ſays he) do you " ſee it now? Is it not, in your eyes, in " compariſon of it, as nothing?" v. 3. Thus it is plain that the glory of the ſecond houſe did not conſiſt either in the grandeur of the building laid out by Zerubbabel and Joſhua, or in the preſence of thoſe great and holy men, notwithſtanding that the prophecy is addreſſed to them both, and that Zerubbabel is ſpoken to by God in a very remarkable manner, at the concluſion of the ſame chapter, *viz.* " I will

" take

" take thee, *O Zerubbabel, my ſervant*,
" the ſon of Shealtiel, ſaith the Lord,
" and will make *thee as a ſignet*; *for I*
" *have choſen thee*, ſaith the Lord of
" hoſts." But the glory was manifeſtly to conſiſt in the " *future coming*, &c. *of* " *the deſire of all nations*." For, as the promiſe was made to Zerubbabel and Joſhua themſelves, the prophecy muſt neceſſarily be underſtood to have a more diſtant accompliſhment; which, indeed, the beginning of the ſentence ſufficiently proves, *viz.* הוא ואנוי מרעיש את השמים עוד אחת מעט *Yet once, it is a little while*, and *I will ſhake the heavens*, &c. Haggai ii. 6, 7.

The prophet Zachariah likewiſe promiſes great things to Zerubbabel and Joſhua; which he applies perſonally to them, as builders of the temple, though the ſame relate ultimately to Chriſt. See chap. iv. 6—10.

See

See alſo chap. vi. 11, 12, 13, wherein Joſhua, by his name, (יהושע which the LXX. render Ιησους, *Jeſus*, ſignifying a Saviour,) as well as by his office and dignity of high-prieſt, was plainly ſet forth as a type of the future Meſſiah.

The prophet orders him to be crowned, and ſaluted with the prophetical title of Chriſt, *viz. the branch*, of whom he foretold, that he ſhould "grow up out "of his place," and "build the temple "of the Lord."

Joſhua might, indeed, be ſaid to build the temple, as well as Zerubbabel, but he could only be a type of the branch there promiſed, becauſe the real branch was yet to grow up out of his place (14).

The

(14) "And ſpeak unto him *(Joſhua)* ſaying, Thus "ſpeaketh the Lord of hoſts, ſaying, Behold the man "whoſe name is the *branch*; and *he ſhall grow up out of* "*his place*, and he ſhall build the temple of the Lord," &c. Zech. vi. 12.

The crowns were given "*for a memo-* "*rial in the temple of the Lord,*" (not of the accompliſhment of this prophecy in the perſon of Joſhua, but "for a memo- "rial,") of what *ſhould afterwards* "*come* "*to paſs,*" *if the people would diligently obey the voice of the Lord their God* (15). Thus we find that *Solomon*, *Zerubbabel*, and *Joſhua*, as builders of the temple, were types of the Meſſiah, the *true builder* of the *everlaſting* TEMPLE OF GOD; I mean, the HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH, *properly* (16) *ſo called*, "*built* upon the founda- "tion

(15) "And the crowns ſhall be to Helem and to "Tobijah, &c. — *for a memorial* in the temple of the "Lord. And they that are far off ſhall come and "build in the temple of the Lord, and ye ſhall know "that the Lord of hoſts hath ſent me unto you. And this "*ſhall come to paſs* (שמוע תשמעון והיה אם) "*if ye will diligently obey the voice of the Lord your* "*God.*" Zech. vi. 14, 15.

(16) The church of Rome is very *improperly* called the *Catholic Church*, becauſe ſhe cauſes a contradiction in terms, by uſurping that *general* title to herſelf alone, when, at the ſame time, ſhe ſcarcely ſeems intitled to be

" tion of the Apoſtles and Prophets; Je-
" sus Christ *himſelf* being the chief
PART II. N " corner-

be eſteemed a part of it. For, notwithſtanding that many worthy members of Chriſt's catholic Church may have ſubmitted to her communion, for want of better information, ſerving God by the ſincerity of their intentions, yet, " *What agreement hath the temple of God* " *with idols?*" (2 Corinth. vi. 16.) Wherefore, " *Come out of her,*" (ye people of God,) " *that ye be* " *not partakers* of her ſins, and that ye receive not of " her plagues." Rev. xviii. 4. She hath perverted the *law of God* (like the Scribes and Phariſees of old) by her *traditions* — " forbidding to *marry*, and *commanding* " *to abſtain from meats*, which God hath created to be " received *with thankſgiving of them which believe and* " *know the truth.*" — Which St. Paul (1 Tim. iv. 1.) expreſsly called *doctrines of devils*. She hath defiled the *catholic Temple* of God, by building, upon the true foundation, " *wood, hay, ſtubble*;" *viz.* infallibility, purgatory, oſtentatious penance, mercenary pardons and indulgences, invocation of ſaints, exorciſms (" *exorciſmus aquæ*;" — " *exorciſmum ſalis.*" — " *Ex-* " *orcizo te, creatura ſalis,*" — " *aquæ,*" &c. *See the Miſſale, publiſhed by the joint-authority of the popes, Pius Quintus, Clement the 8th, and Urban the 8th)* of holy water and ſalt, benedictions of candles, table-cloths, towels, *&c.* baptiſm of bells, and ſuch other ſpiritual *witchcraft* —— praying and bowing before images and ſhrines, reverencing dead mens bones, and other ſuch *abominable things*, *&c. &c.* Theſe are no part of the *foundation* (mentioned above) of the *Apoſtles and Prophets*, whoſe writings warrant no ſuch *idolatry*, *exorciſms*,

or

" corner-ſtone; in whom all the build-
" ing, fitly framed together, groweth unto
" an

or *enchantments*: and therefore even the *Holy Scriptures themſelves* are prohibited, in the popiſh *Index Expurgatorius*. This laſt is, indeed, a precaution neceſſary to the exiſtence of ſuch doctrines; for, if the poor deluded people were permitted to read the Scriptures, they would ſoon be informed that there is but "*One Media-*
" *tor* between God and man, the *man Chriſt Jeſus*;" (1 Tim. ii. 5.) and that "there is *none other name un-*
" *der heaven given among men whereby we muſt be ſaved.*" Acts iv. 12. O that thoſe men, who invoke the *mediation of all ſaints and angels*, (notwithſtanding the plain doctrine of St. *Peter*, quoted above,) would conſider what a groſs affront, by *this execrable ſervice*, they offer to Chriſt, who alone is the *way*, and the *truth*, and the *life!* For their daily prayers witneſs againſt them, that they do not eſteem the *mediation of Chriſt* ſufficient for them, otherwiſe they would not, like the idolatrous Iſraelites of old, invoke "*all the hoſt of heaven.*" 2 Kings xvii. 16. The *Church of Rome* has endeavoured to cloak this abominable worſhip with the ſubtle diſtinctions of *latria* and *dulia*; but the neceſſity of ſuch ſophiſtical arguments proves the reality of that church's backſliding to idolatry. *Heathen Rome* was not more guilty of this crime, nor hath ſhed more innocent *blood* in defence of *ſuch abominations*, under the old pagan emperors, than the preſent Church of Rome has done, ſince her *Biſhops* have aſſumed *their ſeat*; that is, have poſſeſſed themſelves of the *temporal*, as well as eccleſiaſtical, juriſdiction of that ancient city. So that the Church of Rome may, indeed, be ſaid to have mounted

the

" an *holy Temple* in the Lord:" in whom " you (Epheſians) alſo are builded toge- " ther for an habitation of God through " the ſpirit." Epheſ. ii. 20, 21, 22.

Compare the above-mentioned texts with 1 Cor. iii. 11. John ii. 18—22. Luke xx. 17, 18. Acts iv. 11. Pſalm cxviii. 22. Iſaiah xxviii. 16.

It would make a large volume, if I were to collect all the prophecies which

 abſo-

the *ſcarlet-coloured beaſt, full of names of blaſphemy*; (Rev. xvii. 3.) and is, accordingly, moſt truly deſcribed, by St. John, as a *woman drunken with the blood of the ſaints*, and *with the blood of the martyrs of Jeſus*.

Archbiſhop Cranmer, the biſhops Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, and a great multitude of other worthy *Engliſhmen*, have ſuffered under her diabolical tyranny.

Indeed, the hiſtories of all other European kingdoms are fraught with woful examples of it. In Sully's Memoirs (chap. v. p. 9.) we read that a popiſh prayer-book (" *livre de groſſes heures*") ſerved as *a paſſport* among the bloody meſſengers of popiſh vengeance, at the *maſſacre* of the Huguenots, at Paris. " Tuë, Tuë, " ô Huguenot, ô Huguenot," was the deviliſh watch-word!

O that the living members of *that Church* may diſcern, and *repent* of, their *enormous errors* before it be too late!

abſolutely relate to two different and diſtinct ſubjects in the type and antitype. Nevertheleſs, I am particularly obliged to take notice of two more of this kind, becauſe Dr. W——ms has quoted them in favour of his hypotheſis, notwithſtanding that, upon examination, they will be found to make much againſt it. He ſays, (in p. 38,) "It is *not poſſible indeed* to *reconcile Matthew* ii. 15. 23. and perhaps ſome other paſſages in his goſpel, with *any particular prophecy now extant* in the Old Teſtament." As to the 15th verſe, wherein St. Matthew quotes the Prophet Hoſea xi. 1. ("*out of Egypt have I called my ſon,*") the Dr. obſerves, that "the paſſage in Hoſea, where theſe words are found, *is not a prophecy of a future event*, but a declaration of an event long paſt, and therefore *could not be fulfilled* when the child JESUS came out of Egypt."

Now,

Now, in one reſpect, the Dr. is right, *viz.* that the paſſage, with regard to the people of Iſrael, "*is a declaration of an* "*event long paſt:*" nevertheleſs, he has not aſſigned any reaſon why the ſame paſſage may not, *likewiſe*, contain a prophecy *of a future event*, by being intended, like many other prophecies, to bear a double application.

Eraſmus has aſſigned a reaſon for the error of Julian the apoſtate, concerning this text, *viz.* "that he has too much "followed the ſeptuagint edition; *nimi-* "*rum ſecutus editionem ſeptuaginta,*" (ſays he,) "qui locum hunc tranſtule- "runt in hunc modum, quia *parvulus* "Iſrael, et ego dilexi *eum*, et ex Ægypto "vocavi *filios ejus.*" (Annot. in Matthæum, p. 250.)

A miſunderſtanding of this text is very excuſable, likewiſe, in the authors of that Greek verſion, who could not eaſily comprehend, *before the event*, that the Meſſiah ſhould be called out of Egypt, as the children of Iſrael had been before him; and therefore they rendered the paſſage in ſuch a manner as they thought would beſt point out the application of it to the people of Iſrael *only*; και εξ Αιγυπτου μετεκαλεσα τα τεκνα αυτου, "and out of Egypt "have I called *his children*."

But, if the *prophet himſelf* had intended the ſame thing, *and that only*, he would, moſt likely, have made uſe of terms more expreſſive of *a nation*, or *people*, than of *a ſingle perſon*; ("*from Egypt* "*have I called my ſon*,"—) and then the Greek interpreters would not have been obliged to leave the literal ſenſe of the original in order to adapt it, with propriety,

propriety, to *the people of Iſrael*; which proves, that ſome *ſingle perſon* is more particularly pointed at, by the prophet, than *the people* of Iſrael.

There are, indeed, many paſſages of Scripture wherein nations are repreſented by ſingle perſons: Ezekiel warned the *two houſes* of *Iſrael* under the figure of two adulterous women, Aholah and Aholibah, *&c.* But the text in queſtion is very different from many others of that kind; for the people of Iſrael are not only repreſented therein under the figure of a *ſingle perſon*, but ſome eminent ſingle perſon is likewiſe plainly repreſented, at the ſame time, under the *name* and *figure* of the *people of Iſrael*; of which the particularity of the ſtyle affords evident teſtimony; לבני כי נער ישראל ואהבהו וממצרים קראתי "when Iſrael was *a little child*, "and I loved him, and out of Egypt "have I *called my ſon*." But the following

ing part of the text, wherein Iſrael could not be a type of the Meſſiah, (I mean, their forſaking God's commandments and ſacrificing to Baal,) is immediately expreſſed in *the plural number*, as being applicable to the children of Iſrael *only*, and not to Chriſt; להס כן הלכו מפניהם לבעלים יזבחו ולפסלים יקטרון קראו " as " *they* called *them*, *ſo they* went *from* " *them: they* ſacrificed unto Baalim, and " burnt incenſe to graven images." Hoſea xi. 2. Thus it is plain that the text is applicable, in the firſt place, to *the children of Iſrael*, who were brought by God out of Egypt, when *they firſt began* to be eſteemed a nation, and therefore might, as a type of Chriſt, be likened to *a little child*, being *young and weak*, in compariſon of *their future ſtate and power*. And, 2dly, it is undoubtedly very applicable to the *ſingle perſon* of the Meſſiah, who was *alſo called by God out of Egypt* when he was *really a little child*

(17),

(17), according to the plain literal meaning of the paſſage referred to by St. Matthew, who quoted the *ſenſe of the Hebrew text*, and not that of the Septuagint verſion.

The *child*, mentioned by Hoſea as *having been called* (18) out of Egypt, is, indeed, expreſſly named *Iſrael*; but this is ſo far from ſetting aſide the application to Chriſt, that, on the contrary, it affords the ſtrongeſt confirmation of it: for this name was neceſſarily given, in the prophecy, that the application might be

 double;

(17) *Before he could know to refuſe the evil and chooſe the good*; the land being then forſaken of *both her kings*, according to Iſaiah's prophecy, vii. 16. For the angel's meſſage (or call of Chriſt out of Egypt) was delivered to Joſeph upon the death of king Herod the Great, at which time, *preciſely*, the laſt of *the two monarchies* was diſſolved.

(18) The prophecy was, indeed, delivered in the *perfect tenſe*, as a thing already paſt; but this did not prevent the application of it to the *future Meſſiah*, becauſe the *perfect tenſe* is almoſt as frequently uſed, by the prophets, in declaring *futurity*, even as the *future* itſelf.

double; *viz.* firſt to the people of Iſrael, and laſtly to the Meſſiah.

The Meſſiah is expreſſly called *Iſrael* by Iſaiah, (xlix. 3.) in a prophecy which cannot, *at all*, be applied to the *people of Iſrael*, like the former, but muſt relate *entirely* to Chriſt: *viz.* "*Thou art my* "*ſervant, O Iſrael*, in whom I will be "glorified." (xlix. 3.)

Indeed, the true ſenſe and application of this paſſage does not appear without the context: nevertheleſs, I am not ſorry for the neceſſity of a long quotation from this chapter, becauſe it will convey a very clear and diſtinct idea of the birth and office of the Meſſiah, at the ſame time that it proves the point in queſtion.

"Liſten, O iſles, unto me, and hearken, ye people from far; the Lord hath called

called me *from the womb* (19), from the *bowels of my mother* hath he made mention of *my name* (20). And he hath made my *mouth like a ſharp ſword* (21); in the ſhadow of his hand hath he hid me, and made me a *poliſhed ſhaft*; in his quiver hath he hid me, and ſaid unto *me*, *Thou art* my ſervant, *O Iſrael*, in whom I will be *glorified*. Then I *ſaid*, *I* have laboured in vain, *I* have ſpent *my* ſtrength for naught and in vain, yet ſurely *my* judgement is with the Lord, and *my* work with

(19) — " the angel of the Lord appeared unto him " (Joſeph) in a dream, ſaying, Joſeph, *thou ſon of* " *David*, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, " for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy- " Ghoſt: and ſhe ſhall bring forth a ſon, and thou ſhalt " call his name *Jeſus*;" (ﯾﺴﻮﻉ; ישוע *a Saviour*); " for he *ſhall ſave his* people from their ſins." Matt. i. 20, 21.

(20) — " and behold, (ſaid the angel,) thou ſhalt " conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and " ſhalt call his name *Jeſus*." (Luke i. 31.)

(21) — " he ſhall ſmite the earth with the *rod of* " *his mouth*, and with the breath of *his lips* he ſhall " *ſlay* the wicked." Iſaiah xi. 4. See the context alſo

my God. And now, ſaith the Lord, that formed *me* from the womb to be his *ſervant*, to bring *Jacob* again to him, though *Iſrael* be *not gathered*," (here is a plain prophecy that *blindneſs*, *in part*, *ſhould happen to Iſrael*,) " yet ſhall *I* be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and *my* God ſhall be my ſtrength. And *he* ſaid, it is a *light thing* that *thou* ſhouldeſt be *my ſervant*, to raiſe up *the tribes of Jacob*, and to reſtore the preſerved *of Iſrael*; I will alſo give *thee* for a *light to the Gentiles* (22), that thou mayeſt be *my ſalvation* unto the end of the earth." " Thus ſaith the Lord, the Redeemer of Iſrael, and *his Holy One*, to him whom *man deſpiſeth* (23), to him whom the nation abhorreth,

(22) " I, the Lord, have called thee in righteouſneſs, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, " and give thee for a *covenant of the people*, for a *light* " *of the Gentiles*, to open *the blind eyes*," *&c.* Iſaiah xlii. 6, 7. " A light *to lighten the Gentiles*, and the " glory of thy people Iſrael." Luke ii. 32.

(23) " He is *deſpiſed* and *rejected of men*, a man of " ſorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid, as " it

horreth, to a ſervant of rulers," *&c.* — Thus far may, perhaps, be ſufficient to ſhew the nature and deſign of the prophecy. Iſaiah has introduced the important ſubject as the narrative of a dialogue between two diſtinct perſons, who are both mentioned in this laſt (the 7th) verſe; *viz.* " the Lord, (יהוה) the Redeemer of " Iſrael," and " his *Holy One*, (קדושו) " whom man *deſpiſeth*," and who is alſo called *Iſrael*, in the former part of this chapter. Now, it is remarkable, that the people of *Iſrael*, or tribes of *Jacob*, are likewiſe diſtinctly mentioned in the ſame prophecy; ſo that the perſon, to whom the Lord ſaid, " *Thou art my ſer-* " *vant, O Iſrael*," (ſee 3d verſe,) cannot mean any other perſon beſides the Meſſiah himſelf, he alone being the true " *light* " *to lighten the Gentiles*, and *the glory of* " *his*

" it were, our faces from him; he was *deſpiſed*, and we " eſteemed him *not*. Surely he hath borne our griefs," *&c.* Iſaiah liii. 3, 4.

" *his people* ISRAEL." For, though the *Jewiſh Religion* was, for many ages, the only true religion, yet the *Gentiles* were not induced, univerſally, to acknowledge the truth of the holy Scriptures, by becoming proſelytes to *Judaiſm*, but by being *converts to Chriſt*, by whom alone they have been *enlightened* according to the Scriptures. If all theſe things be conſidered, they will (I doubt not) afford ſufficient proof, that the text, quoted by St. Matthew from Hoſea xi. 1. (though introduced in a context abſolutely relating to the *people of Iſrael,)* was, nevertheleſs, propheti-cally intended to be applied likewiſe to ſome *ſingle perſon*, and that the ſame was eminently fulfilled in the perſon of *Jeſus Chriſt*, the only begotten *Son* of God, whom the Father *called out of Egypt* by his angel. Jacob, and the children of *Iſrael*, may, indeed, be called the *Sons of* God, but it muſt be in a very different ſenſe from the former; for they are only

types

types of the true *Iſrael*, (ישראל) the *Prince* of God, who gave this name to Jacob, when he wreſtled with him, that he might render him more conſpicuouſly a type of himſelf; *viz.* as one that had "*power with God, and with men, and* "*had prevailed.*" Jacob was ſenſible of the *divine preſence*, and therefore called the name of the place *Peniel*, (פני אל) or (as it is expreſſed in the margin) *the face of God*; for (ſaid he) "I have *ſeen God* "*face to face, and my life is preſerved.*" Gen. xxxii. 28, 29, 30.

I have already ſaid ſo much concerning the nature of prophecy in general, and have quoted ſo many examples of two different ſubjects being referred to by one and the ſame prophetical expreſſion, that (I hope) I need not any longer urge the reaſonableneſs of a double application, likewiſe, of the text quoted by St. Matthew from the prophet Hoſea; eſpecially

ly as Dr. W——ms has not aſſigned any one reaſon why it ought to be otherwiſe; nor any authority whatſoever for his aſſertion, in page 39, that the paſſage "*could* "*not be fulfilled when the child Jeſus came* "*out of Egypt*," except, indeed, the authority of his own bare word; which, nevertheleſs, ſeems to have had ſufficient weight with the Critical Reviewers, though it is oppoſed to the *expreſs teſtimony* even of *an Evangeliſt*.

The other quotation of St. Matthew, which Dr. W——ms has called in queſtion, is given in the 2d chap. 23d verſe: *viz.* "*He ſhall be called a Nazarene*." This is one of the texts concerning which the Dr. affirms, in page 38, that "*it is not* "*poſſible to reconcile*" (it) "*with any par-* "*ticular prophecy now extant in the Old* "*Teſtament*." But he is greatly miſtaken in this; for the text may certainly be reconciled not only with one prophecy,

but

but with many very *particular prophecies* " now *extant in the Old Teſtament*;" and therefore St. Matthew appeals with *great propriety, in this caſe*, not to one prophet alone, but to the *ſenſe of all the prophets in general, viz.* το ῥηθεν δια των προφητων, that " which was *ſpoken by the prophets.*"

For, though the prophets do not ſay expreſſly that " *he ſhall be called a Na-* " *zarene*," yet many of them do plainly allude to this appellation. Our Lord was called a *Nazárene*, notwithſtanding that he was born at Bethlehem, the city of David, according to the Scriptures (24). He was ſometimes called Ναζωραιος (25),

(24) " But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though " thou be little among the thouſands of Judah, yet " out of thee ſhall he come forth unto me that is *to be* " *ruler in Iſrael*; whoſe goings forth have been from of " old, from everlaſting." Micah v. 2. Compare this with Matt. ii. 5. and John vii. 42.

(25) Mark x. 47. Luke xviii. 37. xxiv. 19. John xviii. 5. xix. 19. and ſeven times in Acts.

and ſometimes Ναζαρηνος (26); ſynonymous terms for a *Nazarene* or inhabitant of *Nazareth*; which (as Dr. Hammond expounds it) ſignifies "*The City of the* "*Branch*, or where the Meſſiah *(the* "*Branch)* ſhould be brought up; and "accordingly (ſays the Doctor) this be-"comes Chriſt's vulgar title, Ναζωραιος" —— "Ναζαρηνος," &c.

Now the Meſſiah is called צמח *the Branch* by Iſaiah iv. 2. Jeremiah xxiii. 5. and Zechariah iii. 8.

A plant, or branch, is the uſual ſcripture-emblem for a child. —— "*Thy* "*children*, like *olive-branches*, round a-"bout thy table," ſays the Pſalmiſt in the cxxviiith Pſalm, 3d verſe: and, in Pſalm cxliv. 12. we read — "that *our* "*ſons* may *grow up* as the *young plants*." Therefore the prophets very fitly expreſſed

(26) Mark i. 24. xiv. 67. xvi. 6. and Luke iv. 34.

ed the *childhood* and *growth* of the Meſſiah by the word צמח before-mentioned; for it properly ſignifies, not only a *Branch*, but *Germen*, a *Bud*, or young twig; which Iſaiah farther explains, in the liiid chap. 2d verſe, by the word יונק a *tender plant*, or *ſucker*; which is not only a fit emblem of the once *infant ſtate* of the Meſſiah, but alſo of his *gradual increaſe* in ſtrength and wiſdom: for "he ſhall "*grow up* before him (ſays the prophet) "as a *tender plant*, and as a *root* out of "a dry ground;" by which he aſſigns the true reaſon of Chriſt's being called the *Branch*. Indeed this whole chapter contains ſo perfect a deſcription of Chriſt's human ſtate upon earth, that no miracle or demonſtration whatſoever can be more capable of affording conviction; and, conſequently, thoſe, who have read it and ſtill diſbelieve, are inexcuſeable. The prophet Zechariah (vi. 12.) ſpeaks of the *growth* of Chriſt, *the Branch*, in the

ſame kind of terms, ומתחתיו יצמח "He "*ſhall* grow up *out of his place*;" or, as it is properly rendered in the margin, — "he ſhall *branch up* from under him." Moreover, this prophet foretold, in the ſame verſe, that he ſhould be named the *Branch*. —— הנה איש צמח שמו "Be- "hold the man (27), whoſe *name* is the "*Branch*;" plainly alluding, by the ſenſe (though not the ſound) of this appellation, to Chriſt's being ſurnamed (28) the *Nazarene*, from *Nazareth*, the city *of the Branch*.

But Iſaiah, in the xith chap. 1ſt verſe, not only alludes to the ſenſe and meaning of

(27) Zechariah commanded that this prophecy ſhould be ſpoken to Joſhua (or Jeſus) the high-prieſt, in the time of Zerubbabel; but I have already ſhewn that he was therein only a type of our Lord Jeſus, the true *branch*.

(28) —— ſeceſſit (Joſeph) in partes Galilææ, —— ibique habitavit in urbe *Nazareth*, unde et Chriſtus *Nazareni cognomentum* accepit, (Matt. ii. 22, 23.) et *Nazarenorum* Chriſtiani. (Acts xxiv. 5.) *J. Uſſerii Annalium pars poſterior, p.* 536.

of this ſurname, but to the very ſound of it; for he intitles him נצר *Netſer*, a *Branch*. Now Chriſt was really called, in the common Syriac dialect, ܢܨܪܝ *Netſeria*, a *Netſerian*, or *Nazarene*, from ܢܨܪܬ *Netſereth*, (called, from the Greek, *Nazareth,)* where he had been brought up, (Luke iv. 16.) and where (according to the true meaning of the appellation, *Netſerian*, or *Nazarene*, when interpreted) he *grew up* as a *Plant* or *Branch*; for St. Luke informs us (ii. 40.) that "*they* "*(viz.* Joſeph and Mary, with the *young* "*child) returned* into Galilee, to their "own city, *Nazareth*; and the *child grew*, "and *waxed ſtrong* in ſpirit, filled with "wiſdom; and the grace of God was "upon him."

And again, in the 52d verſe. —— "*Jeſus increaſed* in wiſdom and *ſtature*, "and in favour with God and man." This exactly correſponds with Jeremiah's prophecy,

prophecy, (xxxiii. 15.) *viz.* " In thoſe " days, and at that time, (צמח צדקה " אצמח לדוד) will I cauſe the *Branch* of " righteouſneſs to *grow up* unto David."

If all this be conſidered, I think the fitneſs of St. Matthew's appeal to the prophets, concerning the word Ναζωραιος, cannot be called in queſtion; unleſs, like the *Critical Reviewers*, (fol. 357.) we ſhould believe, from Dr. W---ms's *bare word*, that Ναζωραιος ſignifies a *Nazorite*; which interpretation would, indeed, render it impoſſible " *to reconcile Matthew* ii. " 23. *with any particular prophecy* now " extant in the Old Teſtament;" according to the Doctor's aſſertion in p. 38.

For the Doctor informs us, in the following page, (39.) that " *the word is not* " Ναζαραιος, *a Nazarene, but* Ναζωραιος, *a Nazorite:*" nevertheleſs it is certain that both theſe words ſignify the *ſame thing*, viz.

viz. *a Nazarene*, (or inhabitant of *Nazareth*;) and, likewiſe, that neither of them can ſignify a *Nazarite*, or (as he ſpells it) *Nazorite*.

For, the Hebrew word נזר *ſeparatus*, from whence theſe laſt (*Nazarite* or *Nazorite*) are derived, is no where in Scripture rendered Ναζωραιος or Ναζαραιος, but is diſtinguiſhed from them by an *iota* in the ſecond ſyllable, viz. Ναζιρ, *a Nazarite*, Judges xiii. 5. and Ναζιραιοι, *Nazarites*, Lamentations iv. 7. Beſides, it is very plain, throughout the whole New Teſtament, that Chriſt was not called Ναζωραιος as being a *Nazarite*, (for he could not properly be called ſo according to the law of Moſes, though John the Baptiſt was really ſuch,) but on account of his having been brought up at the city of Nazareth, which in the Syriac tongue was called ܢܨܪܬ (not with ܙ or ܙ as *Nezereth*, but with ܨ or ܨ) *Netſereth*; for the word

word is plainly derived from נֵצֶר *a Branch*, the name which the prophet Iſaiah has given to the Meſſiah himſelf, (as is before obſerved,) and therefore St. Matthew's appeal to the prophets in this caſe is very eaſily *reconciled* with the prophecies "*now* "*extant in the Old Teſtament*," though the Doctor has declared that the ſame "*is* "*not poſſible*."

Even Chriſt himſelf condeſcended ſometimes to propheſy in the ſame kind of ſtyle that had before been uſed by his ſervants the prophets. "Verily I ſay "unto you, there be ſome ſtanding here, "which ſhall *not taſte of death*, till they "ſee the Son of man coming in his king-"dom." Matth. xvi. 28. And again, "If I will that he (John) *tarry till I* "*come*, what is that to thee?" John xxi. 22. Here our Lord makes uſe of "*the* "*ſame words and phraſes*" with which he was wont to expreſs his *ſecond coming to judge*

judge the world; ſo that his diſciples underſtood that John ſhould not die; whereas the event plainly ſhewed that he "meant of his *coming*" (ſo often mentioned in the New Teſtament) "in "judgement upon the Jews at the final "overthrow of Jeruſalem, which St. "John outlived many years." See Dr. Cave *on the Life of that Diſciple*, Antiquitates Apoſtolicæ, p. 158.

Our Lord likewiſe "*uſed the ſame* "*words and phraſes*" unto theſe *two different ſubjects*, *viz.* his *coming* in judgement upon Jeruſalem, and his laſt *coming* to judge the world, "when occaſion "was to ſpeak of them together," according to the obſervation before quoted from Aſſemblies Annotations; inſomuch that the *day of judgement* and the *end of the world* were expected to follow immediately after the accompliſhment of Chriſt's prophecies, in the xxivth chap.

of Matthew, xiiith of Mark, and xxiſt of Luke, concerning *God's judgement in the deſtruction of Jeruſalem.*

The latter, however, may indeed be conſidered as a ſign, or type, of the *great and laſt day*; and the accompliſhment of the prophecies concerning it is undoubtedly a ſure pledge of *God's future* judgement: juſt in the ſame manner as the *temporary deliverance* from Rezin and Pekah, promiſed to Ahaz and the houſe of David by Iſaiah, was properly the confirmation and pledge of the future diſtant deliverance, promiſed in the perſon of *Immanuel.* Therefore, if Dr. W-----ms ſuppoſes (as he hints in the words of Mr. Collins in page 7.) that this ſign ſtood in need of other ſigns to manifeſt that God would perform it in time, let him conſider the context once more, and he will find that the ſign was not without ſuch a manifeſtation as Mr. Collins and himſelf have

have required. Perhaps it may be ſaid that I have troubled my readers with a great many more examples of "*types*, "*figures, and ſecondary ſenſes*," than were neceſſary for the point in queſtion; but I was induced thereto by the too haſty cenſure paſſed on this ſort of writings by the authors of the *Critical Review* in page 349. where they ſeem to condemn all *types*, *&c.* whatſoever, indiſcriminately, without deigning to diſtinguiſh the difference between *proper types* and *imaginary* ones.

The END *of* PART II.

A

DISSERTATION

ON

ISAIAH vii. 8.

PART III.

A

DISSERTATION

ON

ISAIAH vii. 8.

—— "*Within threeſcore and five years*
"ſhall Ephraim be broken, that it be
"not a people."

THE accompliſhment of Iſaiah's prophecy (in confirmation of which he required Ahaz to aſk a ſign) was not "*an event near at hand*," as Dr. W-----ms ſuppoſes; for, no leſs a term than ſixty-five years was allowed for the accompliſhment of one of the circumſtances contained in it; viz. — "*within*
"*threeſcore*

" *threeſcore and five years* ſhall Ephraim " be broken, that it be not a people." Iſaiah vii. 8.

Nevertheleſs, the king, or regal government of Ephraim, (or Iſrael, for Ephraim in this text ſeems to be put for the ten tribes of Iſrael as ſeparated from Judah,) laſted no longer than about twenty-one years after the prophecy was delivered; for, " *in the ninth year of Hoſhea*," (the ſixth of Hezekiah,) " *the king of* " *Aſſyria took Samaria, and carried Iſrael away into Aſſyria*," (2 Kings xvii. 6.) therefore commentators have generally found it very difficult to account for the number of *ſixty-five years* mentioned in this prophecy.

A very learned and juſtly-eſteemed author (1), in order to ſolve the difficulty, has applied ſeveral texts in the ſecond book

(1) Biſhop Newton on the Prophecies.

book of Kings to an imaginary captivity, or carrying away, by Eſarhaddon, which, if the context be carefully conſidered, will be found to relate, undoubtedly, to the *real* captivity under Salmanaſſar. We underſtand, indeed, from Ezra iv. 2. that the adverſaries of Benjamin and Judah (the Samaritans) dated the time of their ſettlement in the cities of Samaria from "*the days of Eſarhaddon, king of Aſſur*, "*which* (as they ſaid) *brought us up hi-*"*ther*." But there is no neceſſity to ſuppoſe that Eſarhaddon carried any people away into captivity from thence, nor any evidence to ſupport ſuch a ſuppoſition. Was it not poſſible for Eſarhaddon to plant freſh colonies in the land of Iſrael, where it was too thinly inhabited by the former colonies, without having carried away any of the inhabitants into captivity? Surely it was not only poſſible, but moſt probable, that this was really the caſe; notwithſtanding that ſeveral other learned

men, beſides Bp. Newton, have thought otherwiſe; and particularly Fr. Junius, quoted by Dr. Simſon in his Chronicon Catholicum, (pars 3tia, p. 69.) But the Doctor himſelf ſufficiently accounts for the paſſages in Ezra, (ch. iv. 2 and 10.) ſo that there is no neceſſity to ſuppoſe another captivity under Eſarhaddon: — "Quanquam enim Salmanaſar illam co-"loniam primus deduxerit, tamen cum "plurimi incolarum à feris, et fortè peſti-"lentiâ, (ſic enim ait Joſephus libro no-"no,) extincti eſſent, poſtea plures ab "Aſarhaddone illuc miſſos fuiſſe *veri-"ſimile eſt.*" And he likewiſe quotes Nicholaus Brabantinus to the ſame purpoſe: — "Leones enim vaſtaverunt mag-"nam partem populi quem Salmanaſſar "miſerat: propter quod iſte Aſarhaddon "miſit alios loco ipſorum, et cum iis "unum de ſacerdotibus captivis, qui do-"ceret eos colere Dominum."

The

The prophet does not ſay that *Ephraim ſhall be broken from a kingdom in ſixty-five years*, but that within ſuch a time he ſhall be *broken from a people*; therefore it is plain that the prophecy could not be accompliſhed by the captivity of Ephraim and the deſtruction of the *regal government* of Samaria by Salmanaſſar; becauſe Ephraim, or the children of Iſrael, might be ſtill called *a people*, or nation, even after their removal into a ſtrange country; for they could not be ſaid to "*be broken* "*from a people*," until the judgements denounced againſt them by the prophet Amos (ix. 4.) ſhould be fulfilled, *viz.* "Though they go into captivity before "their enemies, thence will I command "the ſword, and it ſhall ſlay them."

It appears, from the hiſtory of Tobit, that this really came to paſs; for he ſpeaks of the frequent ſlaughter made of *the*

people of *his nation* by Sennacherib, chap. i. 17, 18. " *for in his wrath he ſlew ma-*
" *ny.*" And, even in the reign of Eſarhaddon, about *ſixty-five years* after Iſaiah's prophecy, notwithſtanding that Achiarcharus, Tobit's nephew, was appointed over all the king's affairs, (21ſt verſe,) we find an inſtance recorded of the continuation of this perſecution.

For, when Tobit was told (chap. ii. 3.) that one of his nation was ſtrangled and caſt out in the market-place, he remembered (6th verſe) " *that prophecy of Amos,*
" as he ſaid, (ſee Amos viii. 10.) Your
" feaſts ſhall be turned into mourning,
" and all your mirth into lamentation:" for it was then the *feaſt of pentecoſt*, or ſeven weeks, and Tobit had ſent out to invite ſuch of his poor brethren as feared the Lord, that they *might partake of the*
" *good dinner* which was *prepared*;" but, in the mean time, he received this melancholy

lancholy account; (ſee 1ſt, 2d, and 3d, verſes;) which proves the propriety of his quotation from Amos. The ſame chapter of Amos contains a paſſage very ſuitable to my purpoſe, (viii. 2, 3.)

" *The end is come upon my people of Iſ-*
" *rael*; I will not again paſs by them any
" more. And the ſongs of the temple
" ſhall be howlings in that day," (ſee the 10th verſe, quoted by Tobit, — " *and all*
" *your ſongs into lamentation,)* ſaith the
" Lord God, there *ſhall be many dead bo-*
" *dies* in every place, *they ſhall caſt them*
" *forth with ſilence.*" I am ſenſible that the apocryphal book of Tobit ought not to be conſidered of ſufficient authority for the proof of any thing; yet I hope that the remarkable correſpondence it bears to the ſubject in queſtion will excuſe my quotation.

Moſes

Moſes alſo propheſied that the captives of Iſrael ſhould be perſecuted; — " *I* " *will ſcatter you among the heathen, and* " *will draw out a ſword after you.*" Levit. xxvi. 33.

So we need not doubt but that, by this and other ſuch heavy judgements of God, the captives of the ten tribes of Iſrael would be ſo much reduced in number within the *term of threeſcore and five years* mentioned by Iſaiah, that Ephraim might well be ſaid to *be broken from a people*; for we read, in Deut. xxviii. 61, 62. " Alſo " every ſickneſs and every plague which " is not written in the book of this law, " them will the Lord bring upon thee, " until thou be deſtroyed. And ye ſhall " *be left few in number*," (which agrees well with the expreſſion of Iſaiah concerning Ephraim's being " *broken, that it* " *be not a people*," viz. being now left *few*

few in number,) " whereas ye were as the " ſtars of heaven for multitude."

The completion of Iſaiah's prophecy concerning Ephraim is very apparent even in another way; for, though ſome of Ephraim, and of all the other tribes, were afterwards ſettled in Judæa and other places; though we read of *a remnant of Iſrael* (ſee 2 Chron. xxxiv. 9.) that contributed to the repairing of the temple in the reign of Joſiah, king of Judah, long after the completion of *the ſixty-five years* limited by Iſaiah; and though Manaſſeh and Ephraim are expreſſly mentioned on the ſame occaſion; nevertheleſs, this remnant of Ephraim, or Iſrael, could have no pretenſions, as before, to be eſteemed a ſeparate people, or nation, from Judah, becauſe they were once more become ſubject to the laws and regal government of *the tribe of Judah*, of which the authority exerciſed among them by

Joſiah

Joſiah is a ſufficient proof; and therefore, notwithſtanding that on ſome particular occaſions they were diſtinguiſhed by their tribes, yet, as a body, or nation, they were generally afterwards eſteemed a *part of the tribe of Judah*; which accounts for the expreſſion of the hiſtorian, (2 Kings xvii. 18.) "*There was none left but the tribe of Judah only*;" that is, there was none left but part of the tribes of Levi, Benjamin, and ſuch individuals of the other tribes as lived in (or might have eſcaped into) the inheritance of Judah, and conſequently were all conſidered as the proper ſubjects of *the kingdom of Judah*, and have ever ſince borne *the name of that tribe*, viz. יהודים *Jews*. Thus the title of *Jews* became general about this time to all the other tribes as well as Judah; for the kingdom *of Iſrael* was never afterwards reſtored in a ſeparate ſtate from Judah; and therefore, after the captivity by Salmanaſſar, *the land which*

which Ahaz vexed might be ſaid to "*be* "*forſaken of*" one of "*her kings*," (2) or regal governments.

But the ſucceſſion of the kings of Judah continued regularly until the Babyloniſh captivity; and on account of this interruption (or of others afterwards) the land could not be ſaid to be *forſaken of both her kings*, if the regal government was to be afterwards reſtored for any conſiderable length of time: and we find *that many kings reigned in Judah* after that period. I have already obſerved, that, when *Ephraim* was *broken from a people*, the national name of *Jews* became general to all the other tribes as well as Judah; but it is likewiſe remarkable, that about the ſame time the whole Jewiſh nation, (including Judah and Benjamin,)

(2) "For, before the child ſhall know to refuſe the "evil and chooſe the good, the land that thou abhor- "reſt ſhall be forſaken of BOTH HER KINGS." Iſaiah vii. 16.

as deſcendants of Jacob, began once more to be called *Iſrael*, as they had formerly been before the revolt of the ten tribes. In the ſecond book of Chron. xxxv. 3. (3) the Levites, that taught *all Iſrael*, are exhorted to ſerve the Lord their God, and *his people Iſrael*; meaning the whole nation. Iſaiah, in the fortieth chapter, (27th verſe (4),) and ſeveral ſucceeding chapters, ſpeaks of the whole Jewiſh nation under the title of *Jacob* and *Iſrael*: for, though he might write theſe chapters before the change that I ſpeak of, yet it muſt be conſidered that he is addreſſing himſelf to the people in the ſpirit of

(3) —— "And ſaid unto the Levites that taught "*all Iſrael*, which were holy unto the Lord, Put the "holy ark in the houſe, &c. —— ſerve now the Lord "your God and *his people Iſrael*." 2 Chron. xxxv. 3.

(4) "Why ſayeſt thou, *O Jacob*, and ſpeakeſt, *O* "*Iſrael*, my way is hid from the Lord, and my judge- "ment is paſſed over from my God?" Iſaiah xl. 27. — "But *thou, Iſrael*, art my ſervant, Jacob, whom I "have choſen, the ſeed of Abraham my friend." Chap. xli. 8. — "Fear not, thou *worm Jacob*, and ye *men of* "*Iſrael*." Verſe 14. See alſo chap. xliii.

of prophecy, and plainly refers to the latter times. Ezekiel (iii. 4.) (5) was ſent unto the *houſe of Iſrael*, meaning the Jews that were carried into captivity with Jehoiakim: "Get thee to them of the "captivity," &c. (ſee the 11th verſe.) Many of the other prophets expreſſed themſelves in the ſame manner. See Zech. xii. 1. (6) Malachi i. 1. (7) Ezra iv. 3. &c. (8). So that the national names of *Iſrael* and *Jews* were now conſidered as ſynonymous terms; for *Ephraim*, the chief of the ten tribes, was now *broken from a people*, and therefore the name of *Iſrael* did not generally diſtinguiſh them as a ſeparate *nation*, or *people*, as before; though,

(5) "Son of man, go, get thee unto *the houſe of* "*Iſrael*," &c. Ezek. iii. 4.

(6) "The burden of the word of the Lord for *If-* "*rael*," &c. Zech. xii. 1.

(7) "The burden of the word of the Lord to *Iſrael* "by Malachi," i. 1.

(8) "But Zerubbabel and Jeſhua, and the reſt of the "chief of the *fathers of Iſrael*," &c. Ezra iv. 3.

though, indeed, both *Ephraim* and the *two houſes of Iſrael* (the houſe of Judah and the houſe of Iſrael) were ſometimes, afterwards, on particular occaſions, diſtinctly mentioned; as in the thirty-firſt (9) and fiftieth (10) chapters of Jeremiah and eighth of Zechariah.

Nevertheleſs, *all the nation* were *the children of Iſrael! all were Jews!* and in length of time the *remnant of Iſrael* was ſo blended with *Judah*, that many intirely loſt the diſtinction of their tribes, (Ezra ii. 62.) (11) and more eſpecially after the Babyloniſh

(9) "Behold, the days come, ſaith the Lord, that "I will make a new covenant with *the houſe of Iſrael*, "and with the houſe *of Judah*." Jerem. xxxi. 31.

(10) — "In thoſe days, and in that time, ſaith the "Lord, *the children of Iſrael* ſhall come, they and *the* "*children of Judah* together, going and weeping: they "ſhall go, and ſeek the Lord their God." Jer. l. 4. This was plainly fulfilled after the Babyloniſh captivity, as the following verſes teſtify: — "Remove *out of* "*the midſt of Babylon*," &c. Verſes 8, 9, 10.

(11) "Theſe ſought their regiſter among thoſe that "were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not "found." Ezra ii. 62.

Babyloniſh captivity, when the prophecy of Ezechiel ſeems plainly to be fulfilled. " Thus ſaith the Lord God, Behold, I " will take the ſtick of Joſeph, *which is* " *in the hand of Ephraim*, and the tribes " of Iſrael his fellows, and will put them " *with him, even with the ſtick of Judah*, " and make them ONE STICK, and they " ſhall be ONE in mine hand." Chap. xxxvii. 19. And, in the 22d verſe, " I " will make them *one nation* in the land " upon the mountains of Iſrael, and *one* " *king* ſhall be king to them all: and " they ſhall be no more *two nations*, nei- " ther ſhall they be divided into *two king-* " *doms* any more at all."

Agreeably to this prophecy, the children of Iſrael were *one nation*, and under *one king* (that is, a ſucceſſion of kings reigning one by one) during the reigns of all the Aſmonean princes, as well as that of Herod the Great, until Shiloh (the

Prince

Prince of peace) was come, according to the prophecy of the patriarch Jacob, recorded in Geneſis xlix. 10. viz. " *The* " *ſceptre ſhall not depart from Judah*, nor " a lawgiver from between his feet, *until* " *Shiloh come*, and unto him ſhall the ga- " thering of the people be."

The END *of* PART III.

A

DISSERTATION

ON

GENESIS xlix. 10.

" The ſceptre ſhall not depart from Ju-
" dah, nor a lawgiver from between
" his feet, until Shiloh come, and un-
" to him ſhall the gathering of the
" people be."

PART IV.

A

DISSERTATION

ON

GENESIS xlix. 10.

IN the preceding Diſſertation concerning Ephraim, I have obſerved, that the ſceptre was continued in the inheritance of Judah during the reigns of all the Aſmonæan princes.

And I believe the Jews themſelves will not deny, that the ſaid reigns include a part of the continuation of the ſceptre in Judah, as promiſed by the patriarch Jacob: therefore, I preſume, it will not be neceſſary for me to examine the Jewiſh

hiſtories farther back than the time when the ſceptre was tranſlated into the family of Antipater; ſo that I propoſe to begin this Diſſertation where I left off in the laſt; *viz.* with the reign of Herod the Great.

Herod had as much right to be eſteemed a Jew, or of the tribe of Judah (1), as the Aſmonæan princes of the tribe of Levi: for not only the deſcendants of the twelve tribes were called Jews, after the Babyloniſh captivity, (as I have before obſerved,) but even the *proſelytes of the* Jews,

(1) The ingenious Mr. Mann, in the firſt ſection of his 6th chapter *de anno natali Chriſti*, endeavours to prove that Herod was really a Jew. There are likewiſe ſeveral other parts of that learned book which would both illuſtrate and confirm many of the points which I have advanced; nevertheleſs, as I cannot entirely agree with him in all his opinions, and as I had finiſhed my remarks (except a ſhort addition at the end of this Diſſertation) before I had the ſatisfaction of reading his work, I ſhall therefore content myſelf with referring my readers to the book itſelf.

Jews, though they were by birth *Gentiles* of any other nation whatſoever (2).

This is ſtrongly expreſſed by Joſephus, in his account of king Izates, the great Adiabenian proſelyte. See Jewiſh Antiquities, (20th book,) (3) νομιζων τε μη αν ειναι βεβαιως Ιυδαιος, ει μη περιτεμοιτο, πρατειν ην ετοιμος. Which is thus rendered by Gelenius: "Cumque exiſtimaret ſe non eſſe *perfectum Judæum*, "niſi circumcideretur, paratus erat et "hoc facere." And again——ουκ ανεξεσθαι τε βασιλευοντος αυτω Ιυδαιου.—"Neque ullo pacto laturos *Judæum* in regio "ſolio." The Idumæans, (or Edomites,)

T 2

(2) —— ητε γαρ χωρα, Ιουδαια, και αυτοι, Ιουδαιοι, ωνομασθαται. η δε επικλησις αυτη εκεινοις μεν ουκ οιδ' οθεν ηρξατο γενεσθαι, φερει δε και επι τους αλλους ανθρωπους, οσοι τα νομιμα αυτων, καιπερ αλλοεθνεις οντες, ζηλουσι. Dio Caſſius, lib. 36. p. 37.

(3) The Orleans edition of Joſephus, printed in 1611, (fol. 685.) which is referred to as often as Joſephus is quoted in theſe remarks.

mites,) (4) from whom Herod was descended, were not only proselytes to the Jewish religion, but were still more nearly connected with the Jews, by having been governed by the same princes and laws from the time that they were conquered by John Hyrcanus, the nephew of Judas Maccabæus; *so that from that time they were accounted Jews,* as Josephus testifies, Antiq. 13th book, 17th chap. fol. 450. κρατειν αυτοις χρονον υπηρχεν, ωστε ειναι το λοιπον Ιουδαιους. And they were afterwards as zealous for the rights and liberties of Jerusalem (which they esteemed *their metropolitan city)* as the native Jews themselves. See Jewish War, book iv. chap. 16. page 887. — και παντες ως επ' ελευθερια της μητροπολεως ηρπαζον τα οπλα. Thus it appears that the Idumæans, as a nation, had certainly a right to be esteemed *Jews.*

But

(4) "Thou shalt not abhor an *Edomite, for he is thy* "*brother.*" Deut. xxiii. 7.—i. e.—The patriarch Edom (which is Esau, see Gen. xxv. 30.) was Jacob's brother.

But king Herod's claim of relationſhip did not depend upon this ſingle circumſtance of his being deſcended from the Idumæans: his connections with the Jews were far greater than any other Idumæan could ever boaſt of. His father, Antipater, though an Idumæan, was a perſon of ſuch truſt and eſteem, among the Jews, that he held the greateſt offices under their kings.

He ſerved under their king Alexander *as governor of Idumæa*; (Antiq. book xiv. chap. 2. p. 469.) — under their king and high-prieſt Hyrcanus, as *governor of Judæa itſelf, and commander in chief of the Jewiſh army.* And afterwards he ſerved under Cæſar, alſo, as *procurator of Judæa.* See the xivth and xvth chapters of the ſame book.

Therefore, not only as an Idumæan, but alſo by theſe continual connections, as well

well as reſidence among the Jews, Antipater ſeemed to be entirely naturalized to this people; inſomuch that he eſteemed their intereſt as his own; their country as though it had been *his native land!* His aſſiduity and diligence in repairing the walls of Jeruſalem, (ανεγειρει μεν ευθυς το τειχος, book xiv. chap. 18.) when he had obtained leave of Cæſar to do ſo, is a proof of this, as well as Joſephus's manner of expreſſing that circumſtance, *Jewiſh War*, book i. chap. 8. *viz.* και προσεπιλυσχανει τα τειχη της πατριδος ανακλισαι καλεσραμμενα. Thus rendered by Rufinus: — "et præter hoc (Antipater) impetra-"vit, ut ſubverſa *patriæ* mœnia renovare "ſibi liceret." And again, Ανλιπαλρος δε Καισαρα προπεμψας εκ της Συριας, εις Ιυδαιαν ὑπεσρεψεν, και πρωλον μεν το τειχος ανεδειμαλο ΤΗΣ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ ὑπο Πομπηϊυ καλεσραμμενον. Antipater vero, ubi de Syria Cæſarem proſecutus eſt, in *Judæam* reverſus,

reverſus, *ante omnia* PATRIÆ *muros* a Pompëio dirutos reparabat.

If all theſe circumſtances are conſidered, it will not be eaſy to prove, that the *ſon* of ſuch a perſon ought to be accounted a foreigner to the Jews. Herod was born a ſubject of the kingdom of the Jews, and publicly profeſſed their religion, laws, and cuſtoms, notwithſtanding that he frequently offended againſt them all: and, if he did not think himſelf, in reality, entitled to be eſteemed one of that nation, he nevertheleſs omitted no proper opportunity of claiming relationſhip. A remarkable inſtance of this we have in his ſpeech to the Jews, when he propoſed to enlarge and beautify their temple. "For (ſaid he) *our fathers* "built this temple to Almighty God af-"ter the return from Babylon," *&c.* τον γαρ ναον τετον ωκοδομησαν μεν τῳ μεγιστῳ θεῳ ΠΑΤΕΡΕΣ ΗΜΕΤΕΡΟΙ, μετα

τηυ

τὴν ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος ἀναβασιν. Jewiſh Antiq. book xv. chap. 14. p. 543.

There are many other inſtances, in Joſephus, of Herod's expreſſing himſelf in this manner: and indeed the ſingular circumſtances of this monarch's connections with the Jews rendered his claim of relationſhip ſo juſt that it could not be diſputed, although he was not deſcended of any of the twelve tribes. Joſephus, who called Herod's father (Antipater) *an Idumæan*, does not deny that he was a Jew, but only that he *was not deſcended from the chief Jews, who came into Judæa from Babylon*, which had been aſſerted by Nicholas of Damaſcus. Antiq. book xiv. chap. 2. p. 469. On the contrary, Joſephus informs us, that, when the Jews of Cæſarea contended with the Syrians for the right of ſuperiority in that city, they alledged that the founder, *Herod their king, was a Jew by birth:* οἱ μεν γαρ Ιουδαιοι

δαιοι πρωΐευειν ηξιουν, δια τον κλισην της Καισαρειας Ἡρωδην αυτων βασιλεα γεγονεναι το γενος ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ. Antiq. book xx. chap. 6. p. 695. And the juſtice of this plea, ſo far as it related to Herod, *was allowed by the Syrians.* Συροι δε τα μεν περι τον Ἡρωδην ὡμολογεν, &c. See alſo Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 12, p. 797. οἱ (Ιουδαιοι) μεν γαρ ηξιουν σφελεραν ειναι την πολιν, ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ γεγονεναι τον κλισην αυτης λεγοντες, την δε Ἡρωδης, ὁ βασιλευς· οἱ δε ἑτεροι (Συροι) τον οικισην μεν προσωμολογεν ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΝ, &c.

If all theſe things be conſidered, I think they muſt juſtify my expreſſion, that Herod had as much right to be eſteemed *a Jew* as the *Aſmonæan princes of the tribe of Levi*: and, though neither the latter nor Herod (notwithſtanding that *they were Jews)* were really deſcended of the tribe of Judah, yet the completion of Jacob's prophecy, concerning the ſceptre of Ju-

dah, is not at all affected by this circumſtance.

For the ſaid prophecy does not (I apprehend) ſo much relate to the deſcent or genealogy of the individuals, that were to rule in Judah, as to the particular preeminence of that whole tribe, from which the ſceptre (the ſign of its being a diſtinct kingdom) ſhould not depart till Shiloh was come. Therefore, it is not ſo very material to my preſent purpoſe whether Herod was a Jew or not, ſince it muſt be acknowledged, (be his parentage what it will,) that he was nevertheleſs "*king of* "*Judæa*," as Luke ſtiles him, chap. i. verſe 5. *viz.* king of the *tribe and inheritance of Judah*, (as well as of the other tribes incorporated therein,) and that he kept his royal reſidence in *the capital city of that ruling tribe*, as did all the preceding kings of *Judah*, howſoever deſcended.

An

An objection has been made to the common interpretation of the word שבט or *ſcepter*, in Jacob's prophecy; *viz.* that "it could not, with any ſort of propriety, "be ſaid, that *the ſcepter ſhould not depart* "*from Judah*, when Judah had no ſcep- "ter, nor was to have any for many ge- "nerations afterwards." (5) But the learned author of this objection has not conſidered that the ſceptre, or regal government in Judah, is plainly *implied and foretold in the former part of the ſame prophecy*, which entirely removes the force of his argument in favour of a different interpretation of that word. "*Judah*, (ſaid the patriarch,) "thou art he whom "*thy brethren ſhall praiſe*;" (alluding to the meaning of his name;) "thy hand "ſhall be in the neck of thine enemies; "*thy father's children ſhall bow down before* "*thee*." Gen. xlix. 8.

 Now,

(5) See biſhop Newton on the Prophecies, vol. i. p. 95.

Now, notwithſtanding the precedency of the tribe of Judah, in the encampments and marching of the Iſraelites in the wilderneſs, yet this part of the prophecy, "*thy father's children ſhall bow* "*down before thee*," cannot be ſaid to be fulfilled until all the other tribes became ſubject to the monarchy of the tribe of Judah under David and Solomon; which is obſerved likewiſe by the authors of the Commentary on the Bible, called Aſſemblies Annotations. "This" (ſay they) "was literally moſt verified in David and "Solomon, who were of this tribe; and "ſpiritually in Chriſt, the *lion of the tribe* "*of Judah*, Rev. v. 5. to whom all "knees ſhall bow." Phil. ii. 10.—And they obſerve, farther, that "the courage "of Judah is compared to a lion's whelp: "ſuch was the tribe of Judah in the firſt "eſſays of war, in the time of Joſhua; "afterwards it increaſed to the vigour of

"a

" a lion at full age, and old in compariſon
" of a whelp: ſuch it was in David's
" time; and, by age and experience, ſub-
" tle as well as ſtrong; for David, of that
" tribe, was ſo wiſe that Saul was afraid
" of his wiſdom, (1 Sam. xviii. 5. 14.
" 15.) and very courageous, (ſee 1 Sam.
" xvii. from ver. 32 to 51.) as the lion
" above other beaſts, who, by his cou-
" rage and ſtrength, *is a king over them.*"
Num. xxiii. 24. Prov. xxviii. 1. and xxx.
30. Amos iii. 8. Mic. v. 8.

If all this be conſidered, it will appear that שבט, in this text, muſt be tranſlated *a ſcepter*; which is the opinion likewiſe of Monſ. Martin: — " Quoique le mot
" Hebreu ſignifie auſſi une verge, et qu'il
" ſoit employé quelquefois dans un ſens
" métaphorique pour la verge des afflic-
" tions, *la liaiſon de ce verſet avec le pré-*
" *cédent, et toute la matiere contenue dans*
" *ce texte,* ne permettent pas d'expliquer
" ici

" ici ce mot autrement que par celui *de*
" *ſceptre*; de même que dans ce paſſage
" de Zacharie, chap. x. 11. où ſe trou-
" vent en Hebreu les mêmes termes
" qu'ici: le ſceptre ſe départira d'Egypte."

Thus it is plain that the *regal ſcepter* was not *to depart from the tribe of Judah* till Shiloh was come.

Now, the Meſſiah was not born until the cloſe of *king Herod*'s reign, therefore the *ſcepter of Judah* could not be ſaid to depart, or begin to depart, (" *be depart-*
" *ing*," as ſome commentators have fancied,) before that period. Neither could *the land which Ahaz vexed* be ſaid to " *be*
" *forſaken of both her kings*," or monarchies, whilſt Herod continued to reign in Jeruſalem. But, *immediately after his death*, the form of government was entirely altered. There was no longer *a ſcepter* in the tribe or inheritance of Judah!

dah! The Jews had now no other *worldly king but Cæsar*; for *the peculiar scepter of Judah* was departed. They were, indeed, subject *to a scepter*, but it was the *Roman scepter*; which could not on this account be called the *scepter of Judah*; and therefore it is plain, that, at this time, the scepter departed from Judah. A solemn legation of fifty ambassadors, from Jerusalem, (who were backed by eight thousand Jews at Rome,) solicited Cæsar that their regal government might be changed, and that they might be added to the province of Syria, and become subject to the Roman commanders that should be sent there.—Ην δε κεφαλαιον αυτοις της αξιωσεως, βασιλειας και τοιων δε αρχων απηλλαχθαι, προσθηκην δε Συριας γεγονοτας ὑποτασσεσθαι τοις εκειθε πεμπομενοις στρατηγοις. See Antiq. p. 611, 612. See also p. 781, 782. where the same thing is strongly expressed.

Ne-

Nevertheleſs, Cæſar did not, at that time, entirely comply with their requeſt; for, as Archelaus was named by his father Herod to be his ſucceſſor in the kingdom, Cæſar was pleaſed to grant him the half of Herod's dominions, but *not as a kingdom*, for he allowed him the title only of Ethnarch; and, as ſuch, Archelaus had no more right to the *enſign of royalty*, ſpoken of by the patriarch Jacob in the 49th chapter of Geneſis, than he had to the *title and dignity of a king*, which were *never conferred* on him, though promiſed conditionally.

Καισαρ δε ακουσας διαλυει μεν το συνεδριον, ολιγων δε ἡμερων ὑσερον Αρχελαον ΒΑΣΙΛΕΑ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΚ ΑΠΟΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ, του δε ἡμισεω της χωρας ἡπερ Ἡρωδῃ ὑπελελει εθναρχην καθισαται, ΤΙΜΗΣΕΙΝ ΑΞΙΩΜΑΤΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑΣ ΥΠΙΣΧΝΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ ειπερ την εις αυ]ην αρε]ην προσφεροιτο. Antiq. book xvii.

xvii. chap. 13. p. 611. —— From this it appears, that an ethnarch did not differ from a king *in title only.*

" *The dignity of a kingdom*" was then merely promiſed; which is a proof that the ethnarchy, at that time eſtabliſhed, was entirely without *ſuch dignity:* and Archelaus was ſo far from obtaining the *promiſed kingdom,* that about nine years afterwards he *was baniſhed even from his ethnarchy.* See Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 6. p. 784. (6)

In the mean time Herod Antipas, another ſon of Herod the Great, was tetrarch of Galilee. It was this Herod who beheaded John the Baptiſt in his territory of Galilee, and whoſe crafty, baſe, and

(6) Παραλαβων δε την εθναρχιαν Αρχελαος, και καλα μνημην των παλαι διαφορων, ου μονον Ιουδαιοις, αλλα και Σαμαρευσι χρησαμενος ωμως, προσβευσαμενων εκατερων κατ' αυτου προς Καισαρα, ετει της αρχης ενναλῳ φυγαδευεται μεν εις Βιεννην, πολιν της Γαλατιας, αυλος, &c.

ſelf-intereſted, diſpoſition was characterized by the Meſſiah himſelf under the ſimile of a *fox:* for in deteſtation of ſuch *pernicious principles* he even named him from that wily animal. "Go and "tell *that fox*," &c. To this man was Chriſt ſent by Pontius Pilate; not becauſe Herod Antipas had any judicial authority in Jeruſalem, but becauſe Chriſt was accounted *a Galilean*, and therefore Pilate ſent him, as being one that belonged unto *Herod's juriſdiction*. See St. Luke xxiii. 6, 7. (7)

Judæa was, indeed, *ſpiritually the kingdom of the Meſſiah*, of which many inconteſtable proofs are inſerted throughout this work, and compared with the predictions of the prophets; but, with reſpect

(7) ——"when Pilate heard of *Galilee*, he aſked "whether the man (Jeſus) were *a Galilean*. And, as "ſoon as he knew that he belonged unto *Herod's juriſ-"diction*, he *ſent him to Herod*, who himſelf was alſo "at Jeruſalem at that time."

reſpect to its temporal or civil government, it was ſo far from *being a kingdom* at this time, that it was only conſidered as a part of the province of Syria; and for above thirty years together was governed by a regular ſucceſſion of Roman procurators, (8) until Herod Agrippa obtained Judæa and Samaria (in addition to his former dominions) of the emperor Claudius, who likewiſe confirmed his *title of king*. This, at firſt ſight, ſeems a weighty objection to the explanation, which I have offered, concerning the completion of Jacob's prophecy: but, if we conſider all the circumſtances of this reign, perhaps it will appear otherwiſe. Though Agrippa enjoyed the title, pomp, and appearance, of a king,

(8) Joſephus informs us, that Valerius Gratus, ſucceſſor to Annius Rufus, was the fifth governor of the Jews; and that he was ſucceeded by Pontius Pilate—"και πεμπτον υπ' αυτου παρην Ιουδαιοις επαρχον, διαδοχον "Αννιου Ρουφου, Ουαλεριον Γρατον."—Ποντιον δε Πιλατον διαδοχον αυτω ηκειν. Antiq. book xviii. chap. 3. p. 619.

he was nevertheleſs ſubjected in no ſmall degree (as well as his predeceſſors the Roman procurators) to the controul of the Roman preſident of Syria. (9)—For, when he had undertaken thoroughly to repair and complete the fortifications of Jeruſalem, Marſus, the preſident of Syria, had a watchful eye over him, and ſignified his diſtruſt to Cæſar, who cauſed him to deſiſt. Antiq. book xix. chap. 7. p. 677.——And afterwards Marſus exerted his authority as preſident in a very remarkable manner, even *in the dominions of Agrippa, when the king himſelf was reſident therein*; for, being jealous of the friendſhip and unity between Agrippa and ſeveral of the neighbouring potentates, who were come to viſit him at Tiberias, *he ſent and commanded them all to depart to their reſpective governments, which was a matter of the greateſt mortification to*

(9) Antiq. book xviii. chap. 15. p. 615. Της δε Αρχελαου χωρας υποτελους προσνεμηθεισης τη Συρων, &c.

to Agrippa.—— Ευθυς ουν εκαςῳ των επιδηδειων τινας πεμπων επεςελλεν επι τα ἑαυτε δικα μελλησεως απερχεσθαι. ταυτα Αγριππας ανιαρως εξεδεχετο και Μαρσῳ μεν εκ τετε διαφορως εσχε. Antiq. book xix. chap. 7. p. 678.

Theſe are proofs that Agrippa's power as a king was very much circumſcribed in compariſon with that of Herod the Great. Herod was ſo far from being ſubject to the controul of the preſidents of Syria, that he himſelf was made preſident of *all Syria* by Cæſar; (κατεςησε δε αυτον και ΣΥΡΙΑΣ ΟΛΗΣ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ·) who directed the ſeveral governors to do nothing without his counſel and advice. Ὡς μηδεν εξειναι, δικα της εκεινε συμβελιας, τοις ἐπιτροποις διοικειν. Jewiſh War, book i. chap. xv. p. 746. See alſo Antiq. book xv. chap. 13. p. 541.

On the other hand, likewiſe, the reign of Agrippa was ſo very ſhort, in compari-

ſon

ſon of the time that the ſceptre had been departed Judah, that, I think, it can ſcarcely be conſidered as an exception either to the prophecy of Jacob, or to this of Iſaiah, concerning *the two kings*; eſpecially as Agrippa was cut off from his kingdom by a very remarkable interpoſition of Divine Providence: for, after he had ſlain St. James, (the brother of St. John,) impriſoned St. Peter, and otherwiſe grievouſly perſecuted the Chriſtians, he fulfilled the meaſure of his iniquity by accepting the idolatrous flattery of the people at Cæſarea; "*and immediately* "*the angel of the Lord ſmote him, becauſe* "*he gave not God the glory: and he was* "*eaten up of worms, and gave up the* "*ghoſt*;" (Acts xii. 23.) having reigned over Judah only *three years*, according to Joſephus, who, in the 19th book of his Antiquities, chap. 7. p. 679, confirms the account given by St. Luke, though in ſome particulars his relation is different.

ent. Τελευτησας εν Καισαρειᾳ, βεβασιλευκως μεν ΕΤΗ ΤΡΙΑ, πρoτερον δε των τετραρχιων τρισιν ἑτεροις ετεσιν αφηγησαμενος, &c. Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 19. p. 793.

Immediately after his death, (his ſon, Agrippa the younger, being only an infant,) the kingdom was reduced again into a province, (10) and never was any more reſtored; for *the government of the Roman procurators* (which had been *only interrupted* by this *ſhadow of a reign* after eight or nine perſons had been inveſted with that dignity) was once more eſtabliſhed and continued during a regular ſucceſſion of ſeven other procurators, until the time of the general revolt of the Jews, when the juſt and dreadful vengeance of God was ready to

(10) Υιον δε εκ της αυτης (Cypros) Αγριππαν, ου πανταπασιν ονθ' ηπιω, παλιν τας βασιλειας Κλαυδιος επαρχιαν ποιησας επιτροπον πεμπει Κυσπιον Φαδον, επει τα Τιβεριου Αλεξανδρου, &c. Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 19. p. 793.

to overtake them for their wickedneſs and unbelief, according to the expreſs prediction of Chriſt recorded in the Goſpels: Matt. xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.

Agrippa the younger afterwards obtained the kingdom of Chalcis, (11) and ſome other dominions; but he never had any authority at Juruſalem, except that eccleſiaſtical authority over the temple and prieſts, which his uncle and predeceſſor, Herod king of Chalcis, had enjoyed before him; for all Judæa (except two (12) cities in Peræa, and two (13) in Galilee, given to Agrippa) were governed by Felix, the Roman procurator. "Εις "δε ΤΗΝ ΛΟΙΠΗΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΑΝ, Φηλικα "κατεςησεν επιτροπον." Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 22. p. 796. Thus it appears,

(11) Antiq. book xx. chap. 3. p. 690. Jewiſh War, book ii. chap. 20. p. 794. chap. 22. p. 796.

(12) Abila and Julias.

(13) Tarichæa and Tiberias.

pears, *that Jeruſalem* had ceaſed to be the ſeat of *regal government*, from the time of Herod's death to the total deſtruction of that city; except indeed during the three years reign of Herod Agrippa. But it is remarkable, that before this ſhort reign the Jews had not only ſollicited Cæſar by a ſolemn legation of fifty ambaſſadors, (as I have before obſerved in page 159.) that their nation might no longer be governed by kings, but their chief prieſts had likewiſe publicly abrogated all pretenſions their nation could have *to any peculiar ſceptre of* their own: for, when Pilate brought forth Jeſus in the preſence of the main body of the people, who were aſſembled at Jeruſalem on account of the paſſover, and ſaid, "*Behold your king*;" and again, "*Shall I crucify your king?*" they anſwered, — We have *no other king but Cæſar*. St. John xix. 14, 15.

This public acknowledgement of the Jews, that the *peculiar ſceptre of Judah was then no more*; the *limited juriſdiction* as well as *brevity* (14) of Herod Agrippa's reign; and the want of *regal ſucceſſion* for a long time before it, and *for ever* after it; are reaſons, which, I hope, will juſtify my ſuggeſtion, that the ſaid reign is not to be conſidered as a continuation

(14) Joſephus, in ſome parts of his hiſtory, expreſſes a very particular reſpect (if it may not be called a partiality) in favour of the character of Agrippa, on account of his zealous attachment to Judaiſm. Nevertheleſs, the *limited juriſdiction and brevity of his reign* were ſuch, that even Joſephus himſelf did not conſider it as a *continuation of the regal government of Judah*; for, in the 8th chapter of his 20th book of his Antiquities, where he gives a ſummary account of the government at Jeruſalem, under which the office of high prieſt ſubſiſted from the time of Herod the Great to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, he obſerves, that, *after the death of Herod and Archelaus, the government (or police) was an ariſtocracy*; and he entirely omits any mention of Agrippa's reign in this place; ſo that, it is plain, he did not think it properly an exception to his obſervation. Μετα δε την τουτων τελευτην, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ μεν την ἡ πολιτεια, την δε προστασιαν του εθνους οἱ αρχιερεις ἐπιτευλο. Antiq. book xx. chap. 8. p. 702.

tinuation of the ſceptre in Judah: and therefore it is moſt natural to conclude, that the ſame really departed at *the death of Herod the Great*; which period correſponds more exactly to the time pointed out by Jacob's prophecy than any other. Shiloh, *the Prince of Peace*, was then come; and Herod (convinced, by "*the* "*wiſe men from the eaſt*," that a child *was born king of the Jews*) had attempted in vain to cut him off at Bethlehem; (15)

(15) The general conſent of the chief prieſts and ſcribes of the Jews, concerning the place of the Meſſiah's birth, is very remarkable; for, when Herod gathered them together, "he demanded of them where Chriſt "ſhould be born? and they ſaid unto him, in Bethlehem "of Judæa:" for thus it is written by the prophet; "And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not "the leaſt among the princes of Judah: for out of "thee ſhall come a governor that ſhall rule my people "Iſrael." Mat. ii. 4–6. Now, though the Jews ſtill deny that our Lord Jeſus was the Chriſt, yet they muſt confeſs, *with their anceſtors*, that the true Meſſiah, according to the prophet Micah, (v. 2.) ought to be born at Bethlehem. It is, therefore, a matter of the higheſt importance to them, to conſider what expectations they can reaſonably have, now-a-days, of the birth

for, like the generality of the Jews, Herod expected a temporal prince; and therefore concluded, that his own ſceptre and authority was in danger, as it really was, it being *then about to depart*. For, very ſoon afterwards, Joſeph, the huſband of the bleſſed Virgin, was warned by an angel of the Lord in Egypt, ſaying, "Ariſe,

birth of a Meſſiah *of the ſeed of David* at Bethlehem, ſince that place for ſo many ages has ceaſed *to be the city of David?* For, inſtead of the family and kindred of David, it is now inhabited by "*Turks, Moors, Arabians, and ſome poor Chriſtians.*" See *Bohun's Geographical Dictionary*, printed in 1695.——And farther, if any perſon hereafter born at Bethlehem ſhould pretend to be *the ſon of David*, (or of the ſeed of David,) the Jews ought to conſider, whether it is now poſſible to trace that *royal line* down to the preſent time in ſo ſatisfactory a manner, that they might *ſafely* and *reaſonably* give cred it to ſuch pretenſions. "But what is "Bethlehem now? Where are the thouſands of Judah, "of which this was one? What is Jeruſalem now? "Are the tribes preſerved? Has *Judah* ſtill the ſcep- "tre and the lawgiver? Where is its enſign diſplayed? "And *who can now prove their deſcent from David?* All "the ſigns" כלו כל הקצין Gem. Sanhedrin. c ii. §. 21.) "of the coming of the Meſſiah are paſt," &c. Dr. *Gregory Sharpe's 2d Argument in Defence of Chriſtianity*, p. 146. Oh that the *houſe of Iſrael* may conſider theſe things before it is too late!

" Arise, and take the *young child* and his " mother, and go into *the land of Israel*," *(not the land of Judah only:)* " for *they* " *are dead which sought the young child's* " *life*." Matth. ii. 20.

Perhaps some critic may object, that, as Christ was undoubtedly *king of Israel and Judah*, the sceptre of Judah cannot be said to depart at the death of Herod, according to the interpretation just now given of the patriarch Jacob's prophecy: therefore it is necessary for me to observe, that the *sceptre*, spoken of in this prophecy, and the ceasing of the two kings or regal governments, spoken of by Isaiah, can only be understood to mean the departure of the *worldly sceptre* and *temporal regal authority* from Judah and Israel, as necessarily to be distinguished from the *spiritual authority and heavenly kingdom* of Christ; for, as Christ was " *born king* " *of the Jews*," so the sceptre of Judah, with

with reſpect to him, is not departed, but is everlaſting, according to the prophecy of the Royal Pſalmiſt concerning Chriſt's kingdom. " Thy throne, *O God, is for* " *ever and ever: the ſceptre* of thy king- " dom is *a right ſceptre.* Thou loveſt " righteouſneſs, and hateſt wickedneſs; " therefore God, even thy God, hath " anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs " above thy fellows." Pſalm xlv. 6, 7.

The other part of Jacob's prophecy concerning Judah, (viz. " *nor a lawgiver* " *from between his feet,*") does not relate (I apprehend) to the ſceptre or regal government of Judah; for the particle ו (rendered " *nor*" in the common Engliſh verſion, which divides theſe words from the former part of the ſentence) ſeems to point out, that two diſtinct things are here ſpoken of, as Monſ. Martin has obſerved: " Car cette particule, *et*, " marque que c'étoient deux choſes dif- " férentes,

" férentes, *le ſceptre* et le légiſlateur." But, as the accompliſhment of prophecies is always the beſt interpreter, I have been chiefly confirmed in this opinion of Monſ. Martin, by obſerving, that the departure of the lawgiver from Judah was not leſs remarkable, in the accompliſhment, than that of the ſceptre; for the prophecies concerning both ſeem plainly to have been accompliſhed in two different perſons.

The word מחקק muſt be underſtood in a very inferior ſenſe from the uſual acceptation, if the Jewiſh Sanhedrin, or the Scribes and Phariſees, are to be eſteemed lawgivers, as ſome have imagined.

The Lord himſelf is called by Iſaiah מחקקנו " *our lawgiver*;" xxxiii. 22. And, as it pleaſed Almighty God to declare his will to his people Iſrael, by Moſes and the Prophets, they alſo are intitled

intitled to the name of *lawgivers*, as being the immediate inſtruments of God's revelation. Judah might likewiſe be properly called *a lawgiver*, (Pſalms lx. 7. cviii. 8.) becauſe *the Meſſiah* was to be born of that tribe. But the Scribes and Phariſees, or the Sanhedrin, were not ſent by God with any farther revelation than what had before been given by Moſes and the Prophets; and therefore, though they ſat in Moſes' ſeat, (Matt. xxiii. 2.) yet they could not properly be called lawgivers; being only *lawyers*, or *expounders* of the law of Moſes: and, if no perſon among the Jews for above ſeventeen hundred years has had a better claim to the title of lawgiver than theſe, it muſt plainly appear that the lawgiver (as well as the ſceptre) is departed from Judah; and, conſequently, that the Meſſiah came before that time. Malachi is the laſt perſon whom the Jews acknowledge as a prophet in their canon of the Scriptures;

and

and it is remarkable that Almighty God was pleaſed to comfort them by this holy *meſſenger* (מלאכי) with the promiſe of another *meſſenger* or prophet. "Be-"hold, I will ſend you *Elijah, the* "*prophet*, before the coming of the "great and dreadful day of the Lord," Mal. iv, 5. This dreadful viſitation of their nation was certainly accompliſhed *in the deſtruction of Jeruſalem*; for, if we examine the hiſtories of former times ever ſo minutely, we ſhall not be able to find any *national afflictions or miſeries* whatſoever to be compared with thoſe which the Jews ſuffered at that time. This ought to be a ſufficient proof to the Jews of the truth of Chriſt's prophecy concerning themſelves, recorded in Matthew xxiv. 15, 21. (16) Luke xxi.

(16) "When ye therefore ſhall ſee *the abomination* "*of deſolation* ſpoken of by Daniel, the Prophet, "(ix. 27. and xii. 11.) ſtand in the holy place, "(whoſo readeth, let him underſtand,) then let them "which

20, 21, 22, 23, 24. (17) and Mark xiii. 19. ſo that, as one part of the prophecy was ſo punctually accompliſhed, they may ſafely aſſure themſelves that ſuch great tribulation

" which be in Judæa flee unto the mountains."—" For " then ſhall be *great tribulation*, ſuch as was not ſince " the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor " ever ſhall be. And, except thoſe days ſhould be " ſhortened, there ſhould no fleſh be ſaved: but for " the elects ſake thoſe days ſhall be ſhortened."

(17) " And when ye ſhall ſee Jeruſalem compaſſed " with armies, then know that the deſolation thereof " is nigh. Then let them which are in Judæa flee " to the mountains; and let them, which are in the " midſt of it, depart out; and let not them that are " in the countries enter thereinto. For theſe be the " *days of vengeance*, that all things which are written" (Dan. ix. 26, 27. Zech. xi. 1. &c. &c.) " may be " fulfilled. But woe unto them that are with child, " and to them that give ſuck in thoſe days: for there " ſhall be great diſtreſs in the land, and wrath upon " *this people*. And they ſhall fall by the edge of the " ſword, and ſhall be led away captive into all na- " tions: and Jeruſalem ſhall be trodden down of the " Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled*." Luke xxi. 20-24. " For in thoſe days ſhall be af- " fliction, ſuch as was not from the beginning of the " creation, which God created, unto this time, nei- " ther ſhall be." Mark xiii. 19.

tribulation will never befal them again, according to Chriſt's promiſe in the ſame prophecy.

Compare the ſaid prophecy with that of Daniel ix. 26, 27.

But, though this great and dreadful day of the Lord is certainly paſt, yet the Jews do not allow that the promiſed Elijah is yet come. Nevertheleſs they ſent Prieſts and Levites from Jeruſalem to enquire of John the Baptiſt.—"Who "art thou?—Art thou Elias?" and he ſaith, I am not. "Art thou that pro- "phet?" (meaning moſt likely that prophet promiſed by Moſes in Deut. xviii. 15th and 18th verſes, who was afterwards acknowledged by about five thouſand Jews at one time; for ſo many were joint witneſſes of one of his miracles, being convinced by all their ſenſes, of

ſeeing, *hearing*, and *taſting*,) and he anſwered *no*.

But, notwithſtanding that John was a different perſon from Elijah the prophet, according to his own confeſſion, yet he was moſt certainly the prophet promiſed by *Malachi* under the prophetical appellation of *Elijah*, which denoted the excellency of his ſpiritual miſſion; for the angel Gabriel told his father Zacharias in the temple, that John ſhould go before the Lord in the "*ſpirit and power of Elias.*" See St. Luke i. 17. And afterwards Chriſt himſelf bore witneſs of him:—"if ye "will receive it, *this is Elias* (18) *which* "*was for to come*;" (Matt. xi. 14.) and in the ſame chapter he calls him "a pro-"phet, yea, and more than a prophet;" he being the Lord's meſſenger promiſed by Malachi iii. 1. to prepare his way before him.

John

(18) See alſo Matthew xvii. 10-13.

John was likewiſe a lawgiver (מחקק) as well as a prophet and meſſenger; for "there went out to him *Jeruſalem and* "*all Judea, and all the region round* a-"bout Jordan." Matt. iii. 5. And, when he warned them to flee from the wrath to come, "the people aſked him, ſaying, what ſhall we do then?" (Luke iii. 10.) and we find by the ſucceeding verſes that he inſtructed them accordingly, not only with general doctrine, but even with particular advice, ſuitable to the different claſſes of men. Theſe teſtimonies of the Evangeliſts in favour of John are confirmed in no ſmall degree even by the *Jewiſh hiſtorian* Joſephus, who calls him "αγαθον ανδρα, *a* "*good man*:"—for indeed his life and converſation were ſo exemplary and unblameable, that many of the Jews (as Joſephus informs us) believed the deſtruction of Herod's army to be a juſt judgement of God for the murder of

that

that *good man.* (19) See Jewiſh Antiq. book xviii. c. 7.

John was not, indeed, of the tribe of Judah, yet it cannot be denied but that he was *a Jew*, according to what has been before obſerved concerning the Aſmonæan princes and "*Herod the* "*king of Judea:*" (Luke i. 5.) and he might very well be accounted a *law-giver*

(19) "Of whom Joſephus, in the place above "quoted, gives us the following character: that his "whole crime was his exhorting the Jews to the love "and practice of virtue; and, firſt of all, to piety, "juſtice, and regeneration, or newneſs of life; not by "the bare abſtinence from this or that particular ſin, "but by an habitual purity of mind and body.

"Now" (continues he) "ſo great was the credit "and authority of this holy man, as appears by the "multitude of his diſciples, and the veneration they "had for his doctrine, (for he could do what he would "with them,) that Herod, not knowing how far the "reputation of a man of his ſpirit might influence the "people toward a revolt, reſolved at length to take "him off before it was too late," &c. He adds, "that "Herod was very unſucceſsful in his war with the "Arabian king; all which the Jews looked upon as a "juſt judgement of God upon him for that impious "murder." *Univ. Hiſt. vol.* x. *p.* 538.

giver from between the feet of Judah, for he was born in the *hill country of Judea*, (Luke i. 65.) in a *city of Juda*, (Luke i. 39.) at a time *when that tribe was in full poſſeſſion of its inheritance.*

But the circumſtance which more particularly points out the accompliſhment of of Jacob's prophecy in this holy Nazarite (20) is, that John was the very laſt of the *Jewiſh lawgivers or prophets*. For though, on extraordinary occaſions, ſome prophetical ſentences may have been uttered by men adhering to Judaiſm, after the coming of Chriſt, (ſuch as the remarkable prophecy of Caiaphas, the high-prieſt, concerning Chriſt,—" that it was ex-

" pedient

(20) John was a " *Nazarite* unto God from his " mother's womb," as Sampſon, one of the *judges* of Iſrael, had been before him. (Compare Judges xvi. 17. with St. Luke i. 15.) But Chriſt could not properly be called a Nazarite (as Dr. W——ms ſuppoſes him to be) without a contradiction to the uſual ſenſe of that title in the Jewiſh law.

" pedient that one man ſhould die for " the people," &c. John xi. 50.) (21) yet the Jews cannot prove that a ſingle prophet (profeſſedly as ſuch) has been ſent to them from God ever ſince the time of John; that is, for above 1700 years; except they will condeſcend to allow to St. Paul, Agabus, and others of the primitive Chriſtians, the title of prophets: but theſe were under the diſpenſation of the New Teſtament, after the ceremonial and typical law was annulled,

(21) See what a manifeſt (though unwilling) teſtimony, even *the unbelieving Jews* bare of Chriſt's heavenly miſſion.—" Then gathered the chief prieſts and " Phariſees a council, and ſaid, *What do we?* for *this* " *man doeth many miracles.* If we thus let him alone, *all* " *men will believe on him*; and the Romans *ſhall come* " *and take away both our place and nation.* And one of " them, named Caiaphas, being *the high-prieſt* that ſame " year, ſaid unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor " conſider that it is expedient for us, *that one man ſhould* " *die for the people, and that the whole nation periſh not.* " And this ſpake he not of himſelf: but, being high-" prieſt that year, *he propheſied* that Jeſus ſhould die " for that nation," &c. John xi. 47–51.

nulled, and therefore cannot be reckoned among the *Jewiſh* lawgivers or prophets.

This was confirmed by Chriſt himſelf, (Luke xvi. 16.) " the *law* and ' the *prophets* were *until John*."--And again, (Matth. xi. 12, 13.) " for *all* " *the prophets* and *the law propheſied* " *until John*."

Theſe are ſufficient authorities, I hope, to juſtify my ſuppoſition, that the *prophet* and *lawgiver departed from Judah* at the death of John the Baptiſt; or rather, was gradually departing for ſome time before his death: becauſe, as *Chriſt increaſed, John decreaſed*, according to his own prophecy, recorded by John the Evangeliſt, (iii. 30.) " Ye " yourſelves bear me witneſs, that I " ſaid, *I am not the Chriſt*, but that I " am ſent before him. He that hath " *the bride*" (that is, *the church*, or con-

gregation; for John had juſt before been told that Chriſt "*baptizeth*, and "*all men come to him*," 26th verſe) "is the bridegroom: but the friend "of the bridegroom, which ſtandeth "and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly "becauſe of the bridegroom's voice: "this my joy is therefore fulfilled. He "*muſt increaſe*, but I *muſt decreaſe*. (22) "He that cometh from above is above "all: he that is of the earth is earth-"ly, and ſpeaketh of the earth: he "that cometh from heaven is above "all. And what he hath ſeen and "heard, that he teſtifieth; and no "man receiveth his teſtimony. He "that hath received his teſtimony hath "ſet to his ſeal, that God is true. For "he whom God hath ſent ſpeaketh "the

(22) "When therefore the Lord knew how the "Phariſees had heard that Jeſus made and baptized "*more diſciples* than John, (though Jeſus himſelf bap-"tized not, but his diſciples,) he left Judea, and de-"parted again into Galilee." John iv. 1, 2, 3.

" the words of God: for God giveth
" not the Spirit by meaſure *(unto him.)*
" The Father loveth the Son, and hath
" given all things into his hand. He
" that believeth on the Son hath ever-
" laſting life: and he that believeth
" not the Son ſhall not ſee life; but
" the wrath of God abideth on him."

Thus far the Evangeliſt ſeems to be relating the teſtimony of John, the ſecond Elias.

In the 5th chapter (31ſt verſe) of the ſame Evangeliſt, we read, that this remarkable teſtimony was afterwards referred to by Chriſt himſelf. " If I bear
" witneſs of myſelf, (ſaid Chriſt,) my
" witneſs is not true. There *is another*
" that beareth witneſs of me, and I
" know that the witneſs, which he wit-
" neſſeth of me, is true. *Ye ſent unto*
" *John*, and he bare witneſs unto the

 " truth.

" truth. But I receive *not teſtimony* " *from man :*"——nevertheleſs, our Lord condeſcended to give the Jews an opportunity of being convinced by *the teſtimony of man* ; a man, whom they almoſt univerſally eſteemed on account of the purity of his life, which I have already ſhewn from the authority even of the *Jewiſh* hiſtorian, Joſephus.

The mercy of God, therefore, is apparent in this condeſcenſion; and, though our Lord himſelf declared, that he received not " *teſtimony from man,*" yet he added,—" *but theſe things*" (relating to John's teſtimony) " *I ſay, that ye might* " *be ſaved.*"

He then gives a moſt lively and comprehenſive (though ſhort) deſcription of the holy character of this his harbinger. " *He was*" (ſays our Lord) " *a burning* " *and a ſhining light ;*"—and he reminds the Jews, that they formerly teſtified a very

very particular approbation of this holy perſon: "*and ye were willing*" (ſays he) "for a ſeaſon *to rejoice in his light*. "But I have greater witneſs than that "of *John*: for *the works* which the Fa- "ther hath given me to finiſh, the "ſame works that I do, *bear witneſs* "of me, that the Father hath ſent me. "*And the Father himſelf*, which hath ſent "me, hath borne witneſs of me. Ye have "neither heard his voice at any time, "nor ſeen his ſhape. And ye have not *his* "*word* abiding in you: for, whom he "hath ſent, him ye believe not. *Search* "*the Scriptures*, for in them ye think ye "have eternal life, and they are they "which teſtify of me." Thus Chriſt pointed out to the Jews three incon- teſtible indications of the truth of his holy doctrine.

1ſt. The teſtimony of John the Bap- tiſt, with which he *indulged* them, though the

the ſame might be eſteemed unneceſſary for the cauſe of him, who " *receives* " *not teſtimony* from man."

2dly. His own *mighty works*, daily wrought among them, which, as he ſaid, " *bear witneſs* of me, that the " Father hath ſent me."

And 3dly. The *witneſs of the Father himſelf*, though (as Chriſt expreſſed himſelf to the Jews) " ye have neither " heard his voice at any time, nor ſeen " his ſhape;" but he ſeems plainly to direct them to that *witneſs of God*, which has in all ages been apparent in the accompliſhment of the *word of the Lord by his prophets*.

Even the unbelieving Jews themſelves pretended to believe *the Scriptures*, and acknowledged them to be *the word of God*; and therefore Chriſt referred them to

to the Scriptures, as being *the witneſs* of the Father himſelf. " *Search the* " *Scriptures*," &c. But they wilfully neglected to make a right uſe of ſuch ample teſtimony; and were, therefore, inexcuſable. " Do not think" (ſaid Chriſt) " that I will accuſe you to the " Father: there is one that accuſeth " you, *even Moſes in whom ye truſt.* " For, had ye believed Moſes, ye would " have believed me: for he wrote of " me. But, if ye believe not *his wri-* " *tings*, how ſhall ye believe my words?"

In the very next chapter (vi. 1, 2.) the Evangeliſt relates the accompliſhment of one of the circumſtances of Jacob's prophecy, as recorded by Moſes; viz.—" *and unto him ſhall the ga-* " *thering of the people be.*"

" After theſe things" (ſays St. John) " Jeſus went over the ſea of Galilee, " which

" which is the ſea of Tiberias, and " A GREAT MULTITUDE FOLLOWED " HIM, *becauſe they ſaw his miracles*," &c. And again, (14th and 15th verſes,) " then thoſe men," (the five thouſand perſons, who were fed by Chriſt with five barley loaves and two ſmall fiſhes,) " when they had ſeen the " miracle that Jeſus did, ſaid, This is " of a truth that prophet *that ſhould* " *come into* the world. When Jeſus, " therefore, perceived that they would " come and *take him by force, to make* " *him a king*," (for they could not poſſibly give him a greater proof of their ſincerity in *gathering to him* as the true Shiloh,) " he departed again into a " mountain himſelf alone."

The people of Iſrael (as Mr. Mann obſerves in his learned treatiſe de Anno Natali Chriſti, p. 4.) were not the only people that were to be gathered unto Shiloh;

Shiloh; not one nation only is pointed at, in the prophecy, *but many nations*. The patriarch's words were not יקהת העם the gathering *of this people* or nation, but in the plural number יקהת עמים the gathering *of the nations*; which has been apparently fulfilled: for, the nations have at different times almoſt univerſally ſubmitted to the faith of our Lord Jeſus, the true Shiloh; notwithſtanding that many have ſince fallen back into groſs ignorance, ſuperſtition, and unbelief. (23) The *gathering of the people* to impoſtors does not at all affect the certainty of the

(23) We have a dreadful example of this in the preſent ſtate of the once-enlightened Grecian empire, of the greateſt part of Aſia, and of almoſt the whole vaſt continent of Africa. Nay, the greateſt part even of Europe itſelf hath long ſince reſumed the veil of its former darkneſs, and the ſhadow of death: for, the ſuperſtitious vanities of Rome bear too great a reſemblance to the old Heathen idolatries; and the multitude of Atheiſts, Deiſts, and of thoſe who neglect Chriſt's holy ſacraments, is an alarming indication of a *falling off* even among ourſelves.

ſign given by the patriarch Jacob, in *the gathering of the people* to Shiloh.

Many falſe Chriſts have indeed appeared, according to our Lord's prediction in Matthew xxiv. 24. (24) Luke xxi. 8. (25) and to ſuch the Jews have zealouſly *gathered* themſelves: for, "they "received not the love of the truth, "that they might be ſaved. And for "this cauſe God ſent them *ſtrong delu-* "*ſion*" (as foretold by St. Paul) "that "they ſhould believe a lie." 2 Theſſ. ii. 11.

The ſame people, who rejected *the truth* through *hardneſs of heart* and *want of*

(24) "For, there ſhall ariſe falſe Chriſts, and falſe "prophets, and ſhall ſhew great ſigns and wonders, "inſomuch that (if it were poſſible) they ſhall de- "ceive the very elect. *Behold, I have told you be-* "*fore,*" &c.

(25) "Take heed that ye be not deceived; for, "many ſhall come in my name, ſaying, I am Chriſt; "and the time draweth near: go ye not therefore "after them."

of faith, very ſoon afterwards, by a *contrary* infatuation, rendered themſelves deſpicable by the moſt *abſurd credulity*.

Even the Jewiſh hiſtorian, Joſephus, gives ample teſtimony of the proneneſs of his countrymen to error and falſe doctrine, and that they were eaſily led away by impoſtors and deceivers. He relates a very remarkable inſtance of it, in their being led out by an Egyptian to the mount of Olives; from whence he had undertaken to ſhew them a wonderful ſpectacle, viz. that the walls of Jeruſalem ſhould fall at his command. (26)

The ſame ſpiritual blindneſs continued even after *the abomination of deſolation*, notwithſtanding the apparent judgement of God upon them, in the deſtruction of their great (and once holy)

 city:

(26) Antiq. book xx. chap. 6. p. 695.

city: for they have (as readily ſince that time as before) acknowledged the incredible pretenſions of ſeveral impoſtors, who have at different times ſet themſelves up for the true Meſſiah. For inſtance, the infamous Barchocheba, (ברכוכבא or *Son of a Star,)* in the reign of the emperor Adrian, was gladly received, and zealouſly ſupported, among the Jews, until an immenſe ſlaughter of his miſerable adherents plainly demonſtrated that he was more properly intitled Barchozba, (ברכוזבא) *Son of a Lie*. The Jews were alſo notably deceived by Sabbatei Sevi, who wickedly took upon himſelf the character of the Meſſiah. But it is remarkable, that it was the Jews alone, and not *all the other nations of the world*, that were gathered to theſe counterfeits; which ought to demonſtrate to the *preſent houſe of Iſrael* the apparent difference between the true Meſſiah, and the miſerable deceivers above-mentioned.

Thus,

Thus, I hope, I have ſhewn, that the ſceptre did not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, *until Shiloh was come*; and that *the gathering of the people* (not of one nation only but *of the univerſe* at different times) has been unto Chriſt himſelf, according to the Scriptures.

" Bring forth the blind people that " *have eyes*, and the *deaf* that *have* " *ears*. Let *all the nations* be *gathered* " *together*, and let the people be aſ- " ſembled: who among them can de- " clare this, and ſhew us former things? " Let them bring forth their witneſſes, " that they may be juſtified: or let " *them hear*, and *ſay*, " It is *Truth*." Iſaiah xliii. 8, 9.

" Glory be to God in the higheſt, and " and on earth peace, good-will towards " men."

The END *of* PART IV.

AN

ANSWER

TO SOME OF THE

Principal Arguments uſed by Dr. W—MS

IN DEFENCE OF

HIS CRITICAL DISSERTATION

ON

ISAIAH vii. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

IN WHICH

The Opinions of the late Dr. SYKES and Dr. GEORGE BENSON, concerning *Accommodations* of Scripture Prophecy, *are briefly* conſidered.

PART V.

AN

ANSWER

TO

Some of the principal Arguments uſed by Dr. W——MS in Defence of his Critical Diſſertation on ISAIAH vii. 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

I Have pointed out to Dr. W——ms ſeveral miſtakes in his Critical Diſſertation on Iſaiah vii. 13, 14, 15, 16; yet he hath not thought proper to acknowledge one of them, though he has laboured to diſprove ſeveral. Some of the principal arguments which the Doctor has advanced in favour of his hypotheſis are conſidered in the following pages.

But, before I proceed to a defence of my remarks, it may be neceſſary for me to examine a very important queſtion concerning the interpretation of Scripture prophecies, notwithſtanding that Dr. W——ms apprehends the ſame to be "*ſufficiently* and even *concluſively* "*decided already*;" viz. Whether any "allegorical meanings and double ſenſes "of Scripture prophecies are to be al- "lowed?

"It is impoſſible (ſays the Doctor) to "determine when any prophecy is ful- "filled, if it has more than one ſingle "ſenſe. If it has two (ſays he) it may "have two hundred, and all of them "equally juſt."

For the confirmation of this ſentiment, he refers me to Dr. George Benſon's preface to the firſt volume of his para-

phraſe

phraſe and notes on St. Paul's Epiſtles, and to Dr. Sykes's Connexion of natural and revealed Religion, page 217, &c.

Theſe I have examined with as much care, I believe, as is neceſſary, and find, that the third objection to Dr. George Benſon's hypotheſis, quoted even in his own Introduction, p. xxxiv. obliges him to make ſuch large conceſſions concerning types and figures, that, notwithſtanding his great zeal againſt double ſenſes, his denying of them ſeems a mere diſagreement in terms, and not in effect, from the general received opinion.

In his anſwer to the ſaid objection, he allows, p. xxxv. "That, wherever the "*law* or the *Prophets* have declared, "that the rites and ceremonies of *the* "*Moſaic conſtitution* were intended to "point out a moral obligation, or "to prefigure the *Meſſiah*, or ſomething

 "in

" in the Chriſtian diſpenſation, there " that moral intention, or prophetic " prefiguration, is the one true ſenſe " of the text, &c." See the Doctor's anſwer at length, in p. xxxv.

Here he plainly allows of a direct application, in ſome caſes, to the antitype; which he calls " *the one true* " *ſenſe of the text.*"—But how (as a reaſonable man) he can poſſibly avoid acknowledging the neceſſary conſequence of this his conceſſion, I leave all candid readers to judge: for, if there is an allegorical ſenſe alluding to the antitype, (which he calls " a *moral intention* " *tion* or *prophetic prefiguration,*") there muſt certainly be, likewiſe, a *literal ſenſe* applicable *to the type itſelf.*

Indeed the Doctor has in that place refined his argument to ſo ſmall a thread, that it becomes almoſt imperceptible.

The

The next objection, quoted by Dr. Benſon, is as follows. —— Object. IV. " Are not many paſſages in the New " Teſtament taken from the Old Teſta- " ment, and uſed in a quite different " ſenſe from what they have as they " ſtand in the original writer? and " muſt not theſe be called double ſenſes " of the words of ſacred Scripture?"

To this the Doctor anſwers, —— " It " is acknowledged, that our Lord, and " his Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, have " taken ſeveral paſſages from the Old " Teſtament, and uſed them in a very " different ſenſe from what they have, " as connected with the place from " whence they were taken.

" But that will not prove a double " ſenſe of the words. I may quote " a paſſage from *Homer* or *Virgil*, *He-*

" *rodotus*

" *rodotus* or *Livy*, to expreſs my pre-
" ſent meaning, and in quite another
" ſenſe from what it has in thoſe anti-
" ent authors: but that will not prove
" that thoſe antient authors intended
" their words ſhould be underſtood in
" two ſenſes. In the original intention
" they had only one meaning. In *my*
" *accommodation of them*, they have only
" one meaning. And though the ſame
" words may have different ideas af-
" fixed to them; and be uſed, by ſuc-
" ceſſive ſpeakers, or writers, in vari-
" ous ſenſes; yet that does not prove
" that, in the original intention, they
" had more than one ſignification."

Now, I readily allow, that Dr. Benſon's idea of *an accommodation* is certainly true in ſuch caſes as he has ſuppoſed, viz. in quotations from *Homer or Virgil, &c.* " To expreſs a preſent mean-
" ing in quite another ſenſe from what
" it

" it has in thoſe antient authors." And I as readily aſſent to a part of Dr. W——ms's quotation in page 41 of his Critical Diſſertation, from a very learned author, (1) viz. that when " paſſages in " the Grecian poets are cited, or al- " luded to, in the writings of the New" or Old " Teſtament," the ſame " are " not to be conſidered as prophecies." For indeed they cannot otherwiſe be eſteemed than as " *a mere accommoda-* " *tion of phraſes.*"

But, when the *word of the Lord by his prophets*, or (as St. Matthew warily expreſſes himſelf) " that which was " *ſpoken*

(1) Dr. GREGORY SHARPE. —— See his ſecond argument in Defence of Chriſtianity, taken from the ancient prophecies, page 349.

The ſentence, which immediately follows the above extract, ought by no means to be omitted when the author's ſentiments on this head are quoted, viz.

" But, indeed, to an attentive mind, the difference " will appear very great between the citations from " prophane authors and the prophets."

"*ſpoken of the Lord* by *the prophet*," is cited by an evangeliſt, and declared *to be fulfilled*, the idea of "a *mere ac* "*commodation*" becomes highly improper, not only in a grammatical, but alſo in a religious, ſenſe.

Therefore, in anſwer to all that has been ſaid in favour of *accommodations*, I muſt obſerve, that the *fulfilling* of proverbs and phraſes, or of quotations from poets and hiſtorians, by *a ſimilarity of circumſtances*, is ſo widely different from *the fulfilling of a prophecy*, that the true meaning of the word *fulfil*, when applied to the latter, cannot juſtly be aſcertained by ſuch a compariſon.

The word of *a prophet* (eſpecially the word of the LORD by a PROPHET) implies a *foretelling* or promiſe of future things, which muſt in due time be *fulfilled*; as "all things muſt *be fulfilled*" (ſaid

(ſaid our Lord) " which were written " in the law of Moſes, and in the pro- " phets, and in the Pſalms, concern- " ing me." Luke xxiv. 44.

Therefore, when we are told, that " *the word which was ſpoken of the Lord* " *by the prophet*" *is fulfilled*, we cannot, either with grammatical or religious propriety, (as I have before obſerved,) underſtand any other *fulfilling or accompliſhment* than that which was originally intended by the Holy Spirit to be prefigured.

Becauſe we cannot allow, that a ſcripture prophecy is *accommodated* " *to a* " *particular ſenſe, to which it originally* " *had no reference*," (2) unleſs we allow likewiſe, that ſuch *an accommodation* is abſolutely a *perverſion* of the *primary* ſenſe of the prophet: for readers would

(2) See page 40. Crit. Diſſert.

not only be thereby perplexed and miſled with reſpect to the true accompliſhment, originally and ſingly intended by the words of the prophet ſo cited, but would alſo be naturally led to conceive, that the matters, related by the evangeliſt, were intentionally prefigured or foretold thereby, which would be a deception of no ſmall diſcredit to the evangeliſt, if his compariſon had really no other relation to the prophecy than that " of a *ſimilarity of circumſtances.*"

So that ſuch a miſapplication of ſcripture prophecy cannot otherwiſe be conſidered than as a deception leading to a *double miſconſtruction*, as above; which would be as little ſuitable to the teſtimony of an evangeliſt, " *by way of il-*" *luſtration*," as to the original ſenſe of the prophet; whatever Dr. Benſon may think of it, or Dr. W——ms either. See his Remarks, p. 40.

If

If all this be duly conſidered, I think no one can reaſonably ſuppoſe that an evangeliſt would attempt to *miſlead* his readers, by declaring a prophecy to be accompliſhed *or fulfilled* in " a particu-" lar ſenſe to which it *originally had no* " *reference*." See Critical Diſſert. p. 40.

Dr. Benſon, in page xxii. of his introduction, informs us, that " if " the iid and xvith Pſalms can be " ſhewn quite throughout to agree to " king David, then they ought to be " interpreted of him. But if (as ſome " judicious perſons have thought) there " be in them ſome expreſſions, which " are not applicable to king David, then " they ſhould be interpreted wholly " concerning the Meſſiah; to whom " they do, in every part, very well a-" gree."

Now I am of the ſame opinion with Dr. Benſon, that theſe two Pſalms are undoubtedly to be interpreted of the Meſſiah, and I do not at all contend for the application of them to David.

I only object, therefore, to the Doctor's rule of the interpretation, which he has applied to the ſaid Pſalms; becauſe I think it will be liable, in a great variety of applications, to miſlead and perplex thoſe perſons who may happen to adopt it.

For inſtance; the lxxiid Pſalm, of which he ſpeaks in the ſame page, is undoubtedly a prophecy of Chriſt's kingdom, as Dr. Benſon interprets it; yet his rule ſeems to lead him into a real difficulty concerning it; becauſe he is thereby obliged to deny the leaſt reference to king Solomon; when it plainly

plainly appears by the title of the Pſalm, (לשלמה "*To Solomon*,") that the pſalmiſt abſolutely addreſſed himſelf *to Solomon*, who in the beginning of his reign was manifeſtly a type of the ſpiritual Solomon or Shiloh, (שלמה or שלה) the prince of "*peace*."(3)

Indeed, the Doctor's rule can by no means be admitted, if we conſider the nature and general ſtyle of prophetical writings, and the abrupt tranſitions frequently found therein; of which I have given ample and undeniable proofs from the viith, viiith, and ixth, chapters of Iſaiah. See the ſecond part of my Remarks on the Critical Diſſertation.

Theſe paſſages, and many others of the ſame kind, very much confirm what I have written (Part II. p. 104) concerning the paſſage quoted by St. Matthew

(3) שר שלום Iſaiah ix.

thew from Hoſea; (viz. " *out of Egypt* " *have I called my ſon;*") and, I think, muſt prove, to all conſiderate people, that Dr. Sykes (the other champion for accommodations, to whom Dr. W——ms has referred me) has been much too precipitate in declaring (pages 230 and 231 of his Connexion of natural and revealed Religion) " that the prophet (in this text) " is not ſpeaking of *any future* " *event:*" and that the term " *fulfilled,* " *cannot imply a prophecy of our Saviour's* " *going into Egypt or coming from* " *thence,*" &c. The ſame obſervation may with juſtice be made concerning Dr. W——ms, who boldly aſks, (p. 40.) " How can it be ſaid, that any thing " is fulfilled which was not ſpoken " to be fulfilled?" as in chap. ii. 15. (Matthew;) " or not ſpoken by a pro- " phet in the ſenſe in which it is cited " by an evangeliſt?" Alſo the Doctor declares, in page 39, concerning this paſſage,

paſſage, that it "*could not be fulfilled* "when the *child Jeſus* came out of "*Egypt*."

In anſwer to theſe aſſertions I muſt obſerve in the firſt place, that they cannot by any means be proved. And, ſecondly, that it is moſt reaſonable to believe this text of Hoſea to be a prophecy of Chriſt; becauſe the ſtyle and conſtruction of the ſentence itſelf is ſo peculiarly adapted to the *ſingle perſon* of the Meſſiah, that the Seventy have thought themſelves obliged to leave the *literal ſenſe* of the original, in order to render it more ſuitable, in their tranſlation, to *the people* of Iſrael: all which I have before particularly noted.

But there are ſtill other reaſons to be given in favour of it.

Though the people of Iſrael are here ſpoken of in ſuch a manner, that Dr. W——ms

W——ms thinks he has ſufficient reaſon to intitle it "*a declaration of an event* "*long paſt*;" yet St. Matthew expreſſly quotes it as a prophecy, viz. "*that* "*which was ſpoken of the Lord by the* "*prophet*;" which expreſſion could not with any propriety be uſed, if the words of the prophet were merely an *hiſtorical relation*; for they could not, in that caſe, be ſaid to be "*ſpoken of the Lord.*"

Thus it plainly appears, that there is not the leaſt room to ſuppoſe *an accommodation.*

So that, notwithſtanding all that has been ſaid by Dr. Sykes, Dr. George Benſon, and Dr. W——ms, againſt double ſenſes, it muſt unavoidably be allowed, that the "declaration (in this place) "*of an event long paſt*" prefigured *an event to come*; and conſequently that *this ſingle text* affords an indiſputable proof

proof of the ſubſiſtance of double ſenſes in the Scriptures.

Though ſome Chriſtians have run into errors by turning every thing into allegory, double ſenſes, parables, and types, whether they were really ſo or not, yet this is no juſt argument why we ſhould indiſcriminately reject all conſtructions of this kind.

And, though I contend for double ſenſes in ſome caſes, yet I am as averſe to an unneceſſary multiplication of them as Dr. W——ms can be; and therefore reject and proteſt againſt the Doctor's propoſition, (in his MS Reply to my Remarks,) that if a prophecy "*has* "*two* (ſenſes) *it may have two hundred*; "*and all of them equally juſt.*"

The *fulfilling of a prophecy* (as I have before obſerved) muſt mean the *only*

true accompliſhment or completion of it; ſo that it cannot juſtly be extended or applied to any farther circumſtances than thoſe particularly and originally intended; therefore, when an evangeliſt has declared a prophecy *to be fulfilled*, though he may have convinced us that the prophet's words referred to are capable of bearing *a double ſenſe*, (viz. one literal, and one allegorical, or prefigurative, which he himſelf points out,) yet, at the ſame time, he manifeſtly excludes the other one hundred and ninety-eight ſenſes, notwithſtanding that Dr. W——ms thinks "*all of them* "*equally juſt*." For, after a declaration is made *(of indiſputable authority)* that a prophecy *is fulfilled*, it would be, not only impertinent, but preſumptuous, to look for *a farther accompliſhment*.

It is neceſſary, however, for me to obſerve, that the *fulfilling of ſome particular*

ticular prophecies includes a conſiderable length of time as well as a variety of circumſtances and places.

Of this I propoſe to give one remarkable inſtance, which will afford me, at the ſame time, a proper opportunity of ſpeaking more particularly to Dr. Sykes.

The Doctor, in his Connexion of natural and revealed Religion, chap. x. p. 229, affirms, " that our Saviour and " his apoſtles applied the term *to fulfil*, " when there was only a ſimilitude of " circumſtances: and (that) they cited " the words of the Old Teſtament, and " made uſe of that term upon the ap- " plication of them, where they did " not deſign to expreſs the *accompliſh-* " *ment* of a *prophecy*." " You have" (ſays the Doctor) " *an inſtance very clear* " in Matthew xiii. 14, 15. where our " Saviour gives the reaſon why he ſpoke

" to the people in parables: *becauſe,*
" ſays he, *they ſeeing, ſee not; and*
" *hearing, they hear not, neither do they*
" *underſtand.* And in them is *fulfilled*
" *the prophecy of Eſaias, which ſaith,*
" *by hearing ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not*
" *underſtand; and ſeeing ye ſhall ſee,*
" *and ſhall not perceive. For this peo-*
" *ples heart is* waxed groſs, and their
" ears are dull of hearing, and their
" eyes they have cloſed; leſt at any
" time they ſhould ſee with their eyes,
" and hear with their ears, and ſhould
" underſtand with their hearts, and ſhould
" be converted, and I ſhould heal them."

" Our Saviour" (ſays the Doctor) " ap-
" plies theſe words to the Jews in
" Judea, and St. Paul, many years af-
" terwards, applies the very ſame pro-
" phecy to the Jews at Rome." " This
" ſhews" (continues he) " that, though
" the term *fulfil,* when applied to an

" *event*

" *event foretold*, *does* ſignify the ac-
" compliſhment of *a real prophecy*: yet
" it was uſed in caſes where there was
" no accompliſhment of a prediction,
" but only a *ſimilitude of circumſtances*;
" and, conſequently, the application of
" the words of a prophet to a certain
" particular event, by which they are
" ſaid to *be fulfilled*, does not certainly
" imply either a double ſenſe of prophe-
" cy or that ſuch a *particular event* was
" foretold:" " But the real meaning
" of the word muſt be determined by
" other circumſtances; ſuch as, whe-
" ther the prophet is ſpeaking of a fu-
" ture event or not, or, in ſhort, by
" thoſe means by which one knows
" whether the words are prophetic or
" not."

But, before all this reaſoning of Dr. Sykes be admitted, we ought carefully to

to examine the foundation or proof on which it is built.

This he calls " *an inſtance very clear*;" but I hope to convince my readers that it is *no inſtance at all of this matter*, and conſequently that the Doctor's concluſion thereupon is unjuſt.

Were not the Jews one people, and deſcended from the ſame ſtock, whether they lived at Jeruſalem or Rome?

If this be granted, (and I think the moſt zealous advocates for Dr. Sykes will not deny it,) it muſt neceſſarily be allowed, likewiſe, that this remarkable prophecy of Eſaias concerning them (viz. " by hearing, ye ſhall hear, and " ſhall not underſtand," &c. Iſaiah vi. 10.) was *manifeſtly fulfilled* when the Jews rejected the doctrine of Chriſt, whether preached by himſelf at one time,

time, or by his apoſtles at other different times.

So I think I may ſafely conclude that the two *different applications*, quoted by Dr. Sykes of this ſame prophecy, were not occaſioned, as he ſuppoſes, by a mere "*ſimilitude of circumſtances*," but by a *direct accompliſhment* of *the prediction* in *both caſes*.

Now, as this example cannot any longer ſerve the cauſe in favour of which it was quoted by Dr. Sykes; I hope it will not be eſteemed an improper example of a very *different argument*, and therefore I beg leave to claim it, on my ſide of the queſtion, as "*an inſtance* "*very clear*" of the truth of the obſervation which I made above, viz. that the *fulfilling* of ſome particular prophecies includes a conſiderable length of time as well as a variety of circumſtances and places.

However,

However, I muſt not leave this text without coming to a farther explanation with Dr. W——ms concerning it, becauſe he has brought a very heavy accuſation againſt me concerning the parallel account given by St. Mark, chap. iv. 11, 12.

He charges me with *reflecting* "*ſeverely on the character of the bleſſed Jeſus,*" by ſaying, "that he taught "in parables, leſt they ſhould underſtand and be ſaved." "Our Savi-"our" (ſays the Doctor) "gave a very "different reaſon for his conduct; and "Mr. S—— ſhould have rendered the "paſſage, Mark iv. 12. agreeable to the "evangeliſt's words in the 33d verſe of "the ſame chapter: μηποτε ſhould be "there tranſlated *if peradventure*, as it is "in 2 Timothy ii. 25." However, I am not at all conſcious (I thank God) of having

having in the leaſt reſpect offended againſt the character of our bleſſed Lord.

Neither do I know of any *ſevere reflection* in this caſe, except the Doctor's *own charge againſt myſelf*.

Whatever ſenſe the word μηποτε may bear in other places, yet, in the parallel places of St. Matthew and Mark above-mentioned, it muſt neceſſarily be conſtrued "*leſt*;" or to that effect: for, as the ſenſe of the context muſt confirm the true meaning of any particular word, it will be found, upon examination, that the Doctor's ſenſe of theſe paſſages cannot poſſibly be admitted.

The words of Chriſt, according to the teſtimony of both theſe evangeliſts, point out the material diſtinction which he then made between thoſe that were true believers and the reprobate Jews,

whom our Lord called "them that "are without," (ſee Mark iv. 11.) to the former it was "*given to know the my-* "*ſtery of the kingdom of God*," Matthew xiii. 11. Mark iv. 11. but to the latter, ſays St. Matthew, "*it is not given.*"

Now this neceſſary diſtinction is entirely loſt by Dr. W——ms's interpretation, becauſe there is no ſuch diſtinction made in the 33d verſe of the fourth chapter of St. Mark, the ſenſe of which the Doctor propoſes to adopt; for the evangeliſt is there ſpeaking of Chriſt's preaching in general to the whole multitude, including thoſe to whom "it "was given to know," as well as thoſe to whom it was "not given;" and this is certain, becauſe in the very next verſe (the 34th) we read, that afterwards, "*when they were alone*, he expounded "all things to his diſciples."

Now

Now it might very well be ſaid of Chriſt's preaching to the whole multitude of good and bad together, that "with many ſuch parables ſpake he "the word unto them, as they *were* "*able to hear it*;" becauſe Chriſt obſerved this ſame method even when he taught his diſciples alone; and at laſt declared to them, ſoon before his paſſion, "I have yet many things to ſay unto "you, but ye *cannot bear them now.*" John xvi. 12.

But, when the *reprobate* Jews are ſpoken of *ſeparately and diſtinctly* from thoſe to *whom it* was "*given to know*," it cannot be underſtood that the word was ſpoken "unto them as they *were able to* "*hear it.*"

Becauſe, it is apparent that they *were never able to hear it or bear it*; ac-

cording to the true ſenſe of theſe phraſes; which imply ſuch a comprehenſion of the doctrine, as may produce an aſſent, or belief; otherwiſe the prophecy of Iſaiah, which Chriſt then referred to, could not have been fulfilled. "Be- "cauſe *ſeeing, they ſee not*;" (ſaid our Lord;) "and hearing, *they hear not*, "neither do *they underſtand*." (Which is very different from being ſpoken to, as Dr. W——ms would have it, "as "they *were able to* hear.") "And in "them" (continued our Lord) "is ful- "filled the prophecy of Eſaias, which "ſaith, by hearing, ye ſhall hear, and "*ſhall not underſtand*; and ſeeing, ye "ſhall ſee, and *ſhall not perceive*." (Therefore it is plain that St. Mark's expreſſion, chap. iv. 33. cannot be applied to theſe, when diſtinctly ſpoken of from the reſt of the congregation.) "For "this people's heart" (ſaid Iſaiah) "is "waxed groſs, and their ears are dull "of

" of hearing, and their eyes *they have*
" *closed, lest* at any time they should see
" with their eyes, and hear with their
" ears, and should understand with their
" heart, and should be converted, and
" I should heal them" (said our Lord.)
The closing of their eyes was their own act and deed, " *their eyes* THEY *have closed,*
" LEST *they should see,*" &c. So that there was no partiality (4) in their condemnation, they having rendered themselves unworthy of a clearer revelation by their unwillingness to be converted.

They

(4) For " the reason why these mysteries are no
" more plainly delivered unto them, (the Jews,) is
" for their foregoing obstinacy." See ASSEMBLY's ANNOT. on the said text.

Dr. Hammond paraphrases the 15th verse to the same effect, viz. that " this is a just judgement of
" God's upon them, for their obduration and obsti-
" nacy," &c.

Mons. Martin likewise explains this to the same purpose. " C'est à dire, que Dieu se cache à ceux
" qui, l'ayant pu trouver, ne se font pas mis en état
" de le chercher, et qu'il livre à leurs préjugés et à
" leur ténèbres ceux qui ont fermé les yeux à la
" vérité."

They rejected ſuch evidence as Chriſt was pleaſed to give them, which would have been amply ſufficient, had they *not wilfully ſhut their eyes againſt it*; for St. John ſays, chap. iii. 19. "this is the condemnation, that light is come into the "world, and men loved darkneſs rather "than light, becauſe their works were "evil."

Therefore they were *juſtly eſteemed unworthy* "to know the myſteries of the "kingdom of heaven." For, "whoſoever hath," (ſaid our Lord,) "to "him ſhall be given, and he ſhall have "more abundance: but whoſoever *hath* "*not*, from him *ſhall be taken away* even "*that he hath*. THEREFORE, διὰ τοῦτο, "ſpeak I to them in parables, becauſe "they, ſeeing, ſee not," &c.

The words διὰ τοῦτο, "THEREFORE," plainly refer to the foregoing ſentence, viz.

viz. " but whoſoever *hath not*, from " him *ſhall be taken away*," *&c.* So that the ſcope and tenor of the argument would be entirely deſtroyed if Dr. W——ms's ſenſe of the parallel paſſage in St. Mark were to be admitted. For Chriſt plainly intended to ſhew, that the unbelieving Jews would loſe even what little knowledge they had; ſo far would they be from underſtanding or receiving his parables. And the event plainly proved this; for they fell from bad to worſe, until the total deſtruction of Jeruſalem, when *the abomination of deſolation* (ſpoken of by Daniel) was accompliſhed.

St. Mark does not, indeed, expreſs the very words of the prophet Iſaiah, nor mention the quotation made of them by Chriſt, but he plainly delivers the *full ſenſe of them*, as they were really *fulfilled* in the unbelieving Jews, viz.

" Unto

" Unto you" (ſaid Chriſt to his diſciples) " it is given to know the myſtery " of the kingdom of God, but, unto " *them that are without*, all theſe things " are done in parables: THAT, ſeeing, " they may ſee, *and not perceive*; and " hearing, they may hear, and *not un-* " *derſtand*, LEST at any time they ſhould " be converted, and their ſins ſhould " be forgiven them."

The particle ινα (" THAT") followed by verbs in the ſubjunctive mood (βλεπωσι και μη ιδωσι, &c.) cannot poſſibly be made ſenſe of, if the word μηποτε (" LEST") is tranſlated " *if peradventure*;" becauſe the negative μη (viz. μη ιδωσι, and μη συνιωσι, " may *not ſee*, and *may not* " *underſtand*") abſolutely leads to a different ſenſe from that propoſed by Dr. W——ms.

So

So that it is moſt reaſonable to conclude, with Dr. Hammond, that theſe words, ἵνα βλέποντες "*that ſeeing*," &c. "note the obduration of the Iſraelites, "which fell on them from God's de- "ſertion, as a puniſhment for their not "making uſe of the talents which he "had given them; and ſo this verſe is "anſwerable and parallel to Matthew "xiii. 15. or the end of that place in "Iſaiah, recited and ſet down at large "in St. Matthew; but here (and ſo "alſo in Luke viii. 10. and John xii. 40.) "*epitomized and ſummed up*, μήποτε ἰδωσι, "*leſt they ſhould ſee*," &c.

The word μήποτε, therefore, cannot in either of theſe places be conſtrued "*if peradventure*," without deſtroying the propriety of our Lord's quotation from Iſaiah, delivered at length by St. Matthew, and *epitomized by St. Mark*

as above; for the word פֶּן, in the original prophecy, is properly rendered ܕܠܐ in the Syriac, and LEST in the Engliſh tranſlations, and cannot poſſibly bear any other ſenſe agreeable to the context, becauſe the prophet plainly foretold that the Jews would *wilfully ſhut their eyes* (μηποτε) "LEST they ſhould ſee with "their eyes."

Now, men do not uſually *ſhut their eyes* in order *to ſee therewith*, or (according to Dr. W——ms's interpretatation of μηποτε) "*if peradventure*" they may ſee with their eyes; but, rather, that they may *not ſee*, or, according to the propriety of the Engliſh tranſlation of μηποτε, "LEST *they ſhould ſee* with "their eyes," &c.

The cloſing of the eyes, in this place, is indeed a mere figurative expreſſion for the inſenſibility and wicked obſtinacy of

of the Jews; yet the ſame reaſoning holds good, notwithſtanding this conſideration, and ſufficiently proves that the word μηποτε muſt be conſtrued *negatively*, and not, as Dr. W——ms propoſes, "if *peradventure*."

By this example we learn that ſome parables were not only difficult to thoſe reprobate unbelievers, whom St. Mark calls "*them that are without*," but alſo even to the true diſciples themſelves; who, by miſunderſtanding the parable of the ſower, and by deſiring an explanation of it, (ſee 10th verſe,) occaſioned this remarkable anſwer of our Lord, the purport of which is recorded in the two texts conſidered above.

Nevertheleſs, there were very many caſes, wherein the teaching by parables and types was (not only the ſafeſt and moſt prudent but alſo) the ſhorteſt and

cleareſt method of conveying a true idea of the propoſed doctrine, as being very ſuitable to the genius and cuſtoms of the Eaſtern nations in general, and of the Jews in particular; and alſo becauſe the types and figures themſelves would make a very deep impreſſion on the memory, and by their well-known characters clearly illuſtrate the allegorical meaning.

I propoſe now to reconſider the principal ſubject of my Remarks, viz. the prophecy of Iſaiah concerning the birth of Immanuel.

Dr. W——ms has aſſerted (page 44.) "that the evangeliſt only alludes to the "paſſage in Iſaiah, becauſe it was *remarkably ſuitable* to the matter which "he was relating."

This occaſioned my queſtion to the Doctor, viz. "If עלמה does not ſignify "a

" a virgin, in what ſenſe can the text " be eſteemed *remarkably ſuitable* to the " miraculous conception *of a virgin* by " the Holy Ghoſt? And in what man- " ner could the *accommodation of it* " to that ſingular event aſſiſt the ſacred " hiſtorian" (as he ſuppoſes) " *by way* " *of illuſtration?*" See Part I. page 63.

I afterwards obſerve, that the Doctor " has taken great pains to make the " text *remarkably unſuitable*, by inſinua- " ting that העלמה the YOUNG WOMAN" (as he conſtrues it) " ſpoken of in the " text was ſo far from being a *virgin*, " that ſhe was *with child*, even at the " time when ſhe was pointed at" (as he deviſes in p. 31.) " by the prophet."

To which the Doctor replies, " had " St. Matthew alluded to the birth of " this child, it would have been *very* " *unſuitable*."

Now

Now this conceſſion is ſufficient for my purpoſe, becauſe the Doctor's inſinuation, that the evangeliſt alluded only "*to the name Immanuel,*" and not to the other circumſtances related by the prophet, muſt appear entirely groundleſs, when we conſider the words of St. Matthew.

For, though the evangeliſt interpreted the name *Immanuel*, yet this does not prove that he referred merely to *this name*, but, rather, that no other perſon but the Meſſiah himſelf could properly be intitled "*God with us*;" and conſequently that he eſteemed the words of Iſaiah to be really a prophecy, and ſuch an one as could not be *fulfilled*, except in Chriſt alone, who was truly "*God* "*with us.* But farther,—The evangeliſt's manner of introducing the quotation very clearly ſhews that *this name*

was

was not the only thing he intended to allude to.

For he ſays, — " NOW ALL THIS " WAS DONE (τετο δε ὁλον γεγονεν) that " it might *be fulfilled* which was ſpoken " *of the Lord by the prophet*, behold A " VIRGIN *ſhall be with child*, and ſhall " *bring forth a ſon*," &c.

The words " ALL THIS WAS DONE" muſt refer to the relation, before given, concerning the miraculous conception of *the virgin Mary* by the Holy Ghoſt, and therefore the prophecy of Iſaiah, that A VIRGIN ſhould *conceive*, and *bear a ſon*, *was ſuitable*, not in *the name only*, (as Doctor W——ms has inſinuated,) *but* in *the whole quotation*.

Another objection is made, " that " the birth of a child from a virgin is a " fact of ſuch a nature, as not to admit

" of

" of proof." " It is a fact" (ſays the Doctor) " which in the *very nature of* " *it cannot be a ſign to* any *perſon* but " the mother."

Nevertheleſs, the Scriptures inform us that this *ſign* was clearly proved (i. e. the wonderful event that *a virgin had conceived* was known with abſolute certainty) even *before* the birth of the Meſſiah; and this, not merely by the teſtimony *of the mother*, but by other very ſufficient authorities; which rendered the ſign as apparent and indubitable as any other ſign that was ever given, even the moſt ſelf-evident.

For, after the angel Gabriel had revealed to the virgin Mary, that ſhe (although a virgin) ſhould " conceive " and bring forth a ſon;" St. Luke i. 31. the ſame thing was confirmed to her by her couſin Elizabeth, in the hill country of Judea.

" Bleſſed

" Bleſſed is ſhe that believed," (ſaid Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Ghoſt,) " for there ſhall be a performance of " thoſe things which were told her " from the Lord." Luke i. 45.

See the whole ſalutation, and the teſtimony of John the Baptiſt, though himſelf at that time was only a babe in the womb; which clearly proves that the abſolute knowledge of the fact was not confined to the *virgin-mother alone*.

Afterwards an angel was ſent from God to prevent Joſeph from putting away his eſpouſed wife on account of her being with child; and the angel informed him, before the time, that ſhe ſhould " bring forth a ſon;" and, that he might the more effectually convince him of his wife's purity and virtue, he aſſured him, ſaying, " *that which is*

" *conceived in her is of the Holy Ghoſt.*" Matt. i. 20.

Therefore, though " the birth of a " child from a virgin" is by Dr. W——ms eſteemed " a fact of ſuch a nature as " not to admit of proof," yet nothing is impoſſible with God, who was pleaſed to give theſe indubitable proofs of the long-promiſed ſign even while the child Jeſus was in the womb, which muſt entirely obviate the Doctor's objection, that " *this cannot be a ſign to any perſon* " *but the mother.*"

In the fulneſs of time the ſign was manifeſted in the moſt extraordinary manner.

An angel, accompanied with a multitude of the heavenly hoſt, proclaimed the wonderful birth to the ſhepherds in the field; and a ſtar pointed out to the

the eaſtern ſtrangers the place where the young child lay.

Undoubtedly, this wonderful circumſtance, that A VIRGIN HAD BROUGHT FORTH A SON, would, in a little time, be as well known to *the houſe of David* as theſe miraculous manifeſtations and confirmations of the ſaid ſupernatural birth; eſpecially as the family of Joſeph, the bleſſed virgin's huſband, was *the chief branch of that royal ſtock*, lineally deſcended from Zorababel, and ſo from the ſon of Jeſſe.

There is ſtill another difficulty with Dr. W——ms. "I cannot perceive" (ſays he) "*what event* the birth of "Immanuel could be a ſign of, unleſs it "*could be a ſign of itſelf.*"

But is it really poſſible that Dr. W——ms "*cannot perceive*" that the

miraculous birth of the true Immanuel was a ſign of ſomething more than that event itſelf?

Was it not a ſign to all thoſe, who then waited for "*the conſolation and* "*redemption of Iſrael,*" (Luke ii. 25.) that *the kingdom of God* was *nigh at hand?* (Matthew xii. 28. (5) Luke x. 9, 11.) (6).

Was it not a ſign to *Joſeph, and others of the houſe of David,* that a child, ſo born, muſt be the long-promiſed Meſſiah of the *ſeed of David,* to whom *the kingdom was to be reſtored,* and in whom (according to Iſaiah's promiſe to his cotemporaries of *the houſe of David)* it

(5) "But if I caſt out devils by the Spirit of God, "then *the kingdom* of *God is come* unto you."

(6) "And ſay unto them, the kingdom of God *is* "*come* nigh unto you.—Notwithſtanding, be ye ſure "of this, that the kingdom of God is come nigh "unto you."

it was to be eſtabliſhed for ever? See Iſaiah ix. 6, 7. 2 Sam. vii. 16.

But, I find, it is in vain that I urge to Dr. W——ms the accompliſhment of the ſeveral prophecies concerning the eſtabliſhment of the "*kingdom of David*" in Chriſt; for the Doctor ſtill ſeems to perſiſt in his former notion that Nathaniel "*laboured under a miſtake*" in calling Chriſt "*king of Iſrael.*"

He hopes to evade the point, by alledging, that "not only Nathaniel and "the diſciples, but the whole Jewiſh "nation, did actually labour under a "great miſtake about *the nature* of the "Meſſiah's kingdom."

Thus he would lead me to a very different queſtion; but I am aware that, though the diſciples did, for ſome time, "*labour under a miſtake,*" as the Doctor

tor obſerves, concerning "*the nature of* "*the Meſſiah's kingdom,*" yet there was *not the leaſt miſtake,* in thoſe who truly believed, concerning the main point in queſtion, viz. whether or not the Meſſiah *was really a king.*

Notwithſtanding that our Lord rejected all the temporal authority of a worldly king, and declared that his kingdom was not of this world, he was nevertheleſs really a king, "*king of* "*Iſrael,*" (as Nathaniel called him,) and king of Judah, or (which is the ſame thing) "*king of the Jews;*" for even Pilate himſelf ſeemed convinced of Chriſt's juſt right to the title of *king,* though, like a thorough-paced time-ſerver, he preferred his own temporal intereſt to all other conſiderations, and delivered up THE KING OF KINGS (Rev. xvii. 14.) to be ſlain, knowing him to be A KING; for, his anſwer to the

the chief prieſts, concerning the title intended to be affixed to the croſs, plainly ſhews that he was conſcious of this.

Dr. W——ms charges me with having "brought a vaſt number of texts to "prove, not (my) aſſertion, that Jeſus "was ever called the king of Judah, "but the truth of (his) aſſertion," &c. concerning the miſtake of Nathaniel. And he ſays, "this will be evident to "every one who conſults the paſſages "cited by me."

But, if the Doctor will pleaſe once more to conſult the paſſages himſelf, he will find that ſeveral among them are prophecies which were abſolutely fulfilled in our Lord Jeſus.

Therefore, I hope, he will not venture to aſſert that the prophets likewiſe "*laboured under a miſtake*" when they proclaimed

proclaimed theſe titles of the glorious Meſſiah; or that the diſciples, and all other Chriſtians even to this day, ſtill "labour *under a miſtake*" in applying them to Chriſt, in whom alone they were or could be fulfilled.

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of "Zion; ſhout, O daughter of Jeruſa-"lem: behold THY KING *cometh un-*"*to thee:*" the prophet then proceeds to deſcribe *this coming of* THE KING *of Zion and Jeruſalem*, ſo as exactly to correſpond with the evangeliſt's account (Luke xix. 37, 38.) of Chriſt's public entry into Jeruſalem, when "the whole "multitude of the diſciples began to re-"joice and praiſe God with a loud voice "for all the *mighty works* that they had "ſeen: ſaying, *bleſſed be* THE KING "*that cometh* in the *name of the Lord*," &c. For he was certainly *a king* even when he rode upon the aſs, which is proved

proved by the continuation of Zechariah's prophecy, (ix. 9.) whereby he points out the character and appearance of *the king of Zion and Jeruſalem*, mentioned in the beginning of the ſame verſe; " he is juſt," (ſaid the prophet,) " and having ſalvation, lowly, and riding " upon an aſs, and upon a colt, the " foal of an aſs."

So the prophet Micah declared, that out of *Bethlehem Ephratah* ſhould " he " come forth that is to be *ruler in* " *Iſrael*, whoſe goings forth have been " from of old, from everlaſting." (Chap. v. 2.)

The event proved the truth of the prophet's words, as well as of the evangeliſt's citation, (Matt. ii. 5 and 6.) for the holy one that was born at *Bethlehem*, was afterwards undoubtely " *ruler in* " *Iſrael*," before the diſſolution of that

people from an united nation: of which (beſides the power of his teaching and his mighty works) his public entry into Jeruſalem, and the authority ſhewn by him in clearing the temple, are remarkable proofs.

That Chriſt was "a *ruler in Iſrael*" is implied in the preceding words of the ſame prophet, (Micah v. 1.) "they "ſhall *ſmite the judge of Iſrael* with "a rod upon the cheek." A *ruler* and a *judge* are ſynonymous terms; and it is certain that Chriſt pronounced *judgement* againſt *Iſrael* for their impenitence and want of faith; condemning them (with reſpect to their *temporal eſtate*) to a horrid deſtruction and deſolation: (7) and all this was moſt punctually fulfilled (8) upon them; it is certain, likewiſe, that the ſame "*judge of Iſrael*," whom they ſmote

(7) St. Matthew, chap. xxiv.

(8) See Joſephus's account of the Jewiſh War.

ſmote upon the cheek, will *one day judge them*, alſo, in their *eternal ſtate*, as well as all their unhappy deſcendants who perſiſt in the ſame belief.

If theſe prophecies were really *fulfilled* in Jeſus, they moſt certainly prove that the Meſſiah was (as he ever will be) A KING, and conſequently that his diſciples were not miſtaken in calling him ſo, howſoever they might miſunderſtand the *nature* of his kingdom.

Therefore the Doctor's reply upon this point cannot be well eſteemed a proof of any thing more than of his own great unwillingneſs to acknowledge that he himſelf (inſtead of Nathaniel) *labours under a miſtake*.

Another remarkable excuſe which the Doctor has offered in behalf of his hypotheſis, deſerves particular notice.

In anſwer to my Remarks on Canticles vi. 8. (concerning the particular diſtinction there made of virgins from queens and concubines,) the Doctor replies, that " *Hebrew poetry is not ſo well* " *underſtood* as to enable (me) to deter- " mine that עלמות in Canticles vi. 8. is " not uſed inſtead of בתולה *for the ſake* " *of metre.*"

This unexpected turn of thought may, perhaps, be eſteemed ingenious, but it is far from ſatisfactory; for, if critics were allowed to ſubſtitute the ſenſe of one word for another, whenever their arguments are reduced to that neceſſity, it would be but a vain taſk to diſpute with them; and a confuſion of language, like that of the builders of Babel, muſt neceſſarily ſucceed their perverſion of words.

In

In Engliſh poetry the Doctor may produce as many inſtances of ſuch ſubſtitutions as he pleaſes, and he may reſt aſſured that I ſhall never think it worth my while to attempt a confutation of them.

But, when ſuch refined criticiſms are applied to any part of Holy Scripture, I think they ought not by any means to be admitted, unleſs the authors of them ſhall be able to prove that it is more juſtifiable to adapt the Scriptures to our own private opinions, than our opinions to the Scriptures.

The END *of* PART V.

INDEX

OF

Texts referred to in the foregoing Work;

OF THE

Various Topics diſcuſſed;

AND OF THE

Different Authors referred to.

I N D E X

INDEX

OF

Texts referred to in the foregoing Work.

GENESIS.

Chap.	Verses.	Pages.
iii.	15.	55.
xxiv.	43.	17. 21 n.
xxv.	30.	148 n.
xxx.	28 to 30.	111.
xlix.	8.	155.
	10.	142. 145. 174. 179.

EXODUS.

ii.	8.	17. 21 n.
x.	20.	18.
xxii.	16.	12. 14.

LEVITICUS.

xxiv.	33.	134.

NUMBERS.

xxi.	8, 9.	53 n.
xxiii.	24.	157.
xxvi.	59.	18.

DEUTERONOMY.

Chap.	Verses.	Pages.
xviii.	15. 18.	179.
xxii.	21.	18.
	23, 24.	16.
	28.	15.
xxiii.	7.	148 n.
xxviii.	61. 62.	134.

JUDGES.

xiii.	5.	119.
xvi.	17.	183 n.

1 SAMUEL.

xvii.	32 to 51.	157.
xviii.	5. 14, 15.	157.

2 SAMUEL.

vii.	13, 14.	91.
	16.	56. 245.

2 KINGS.

xvi.	6.	25.
xvii.	6.	128.
	16.	98 n.
	18.	136.

1 CHRONICLES.

xxii.	9.	91.

2 CHRONICLES.

xxviii.	23, 24.	30.
xxix.		30 n.
	24.	30.
xxx.	1. 11. 18.	31.
xxxiv.	9.	135.
xxxv.	3.	138.

EZRA.

ii.	62.	140 n.
iv.	2.	129.
	3.	139 n.
	2. 10.	130.

ESTHER.

ii.	2.	30 n.

PSALMS.

ii.		211.
xvi.		211.
xxxvii.	19.	88 n.
xlv.	6, 7.	174.
lx.	7.	176.
lxviii.	25.	16.
lxxii.		92. 212.
cviii.	8.	176.
cxviii.	22.	99.
cxxvii.	5.	88 n.
cxxviii.	3.	114.

PSALMS *continued.*

cxliv.	12.	114.

PROVERBS.

xxviii.	1.	157.
xxx.	19.	11. 21 n.
	20.	13 n.
	30.	157.

CANTICLES.

i.	3.	18. 21 n.
vi.	8.	13. 19 n.
		21 n. 252.

ISAIAH.

iv.	2.	114.
vi.	10.	222.
	9, 10.	228.
vii.		75, 76.
		80. 213.
vii.	5, 6.	55.
	4, 7.	58.
	8.	33. 127.
		128. 131.
		153. 158.
	13.	57.
	13 to 16.	7. 22. 201.
	14.	21 n. 35.
		80.
	14 to 16.	47. 81.
	16.	21 to 47.
		105 n.
		137 n.
viii.		127. 128.
		131.
	4.	52.
	3, 4.	52.
	4. 6, 7, 8.	76. 77.
	8.	31.

ISAIAH *continued.*

viii. 14. 31.
13 to 16. 77. 86. 87.
ix. 75. 77. 80. 89. 213.
1, 2. 79.
6. 80. 91.
7. 59.
6, 7. 244.
6. 7. 9.
10, 11. 21. 77 n.
xi. 1. 116.
4. 107 n.
xxviii. 10. 13. 81.
16. 87. 99.
xxxiii. 22. 175.
xl. 27. 138 n.
xli. 8. 14. 138 n.
xlii. 6, 7. 108 n.
xliii. 138 n.
8, 9. 197.
xlix. 1 to 4. 106 to 111.
3. 106.
4 to 7. 107 to 111.
liii. 84.
2. 114.
3, 4. 190 n.

JEREMIAH.

xxiii. 5. 114.
5, 6. 85 n.
xxx. 9. 85 n.
xxxi. 22. 55.
31. 140 n.
xxxiii. 15. 118.
16. 85 n.

JEREMIAH *continued.*

l. 1. 4. 8, 9, 10. } 140 n.

LAMENTATIONS.

iv. 7. 119.

EZEKIEL.

iii. 4. 11. 139.
4. 139 n.
xxxiv. 23, 24. 42.
xxxvii. 19, 22. 141.
24. 42.
xliv. 22. 15. 19.

DANIEL.

ix. 26, 27. 178 n. 179.
xii. 11. 177 n.

HOSEA.

xi. 1. 100. 110. 214. 215.
2. 104.
5. 33.

AMOS.

iii. 8. 157.
viii. 2, 3. 133.
10. 132. 133.
ix. 4. 131.

MICAH.

v. 1. 250.
2. 45. 113 n. 171 n. 249.
8. 157.

HAGGAI.

ii. 92.
3. 93.
6, 7. 94.
7. 83. 93.
9. 93.

ZECHARIAH.

iii. 8. 114.
iv. 6 to 10. 94.
vi. 11 to 15. 95. 96 n.
12. 95 n. 115.
viii. 140.
ix. 5. 32.
9. 44.
x. 11. 33. 158.
xi. 1. 178 n.
xii. 1. 139.

MALACHI.

i. 1. 139.
iii. 1. 180.
iv. 5. 177.

TOBIT.

i. 17, 18. 21. 132.
ii. 2, 3. 6. 132.

MATTHEW.

i. 18 to 23. 60.
20. 242.
20, 21. 107 n.
22. 207.
22, 23. 60.
ii. 1, 2. 41.
2. 171. 173.
4 to 6. 171 n.
5. 113 n. 181.

MATTHEW *continued.*

ii. 5, 6. 249.
15. 100.
15. 23. 100.
20. 39.
22, 23. 116 n.
23. 112.
iii. 5. 181.
xi. 12, 13. 185.
14. 180.
xii. 28. 244.
xiii. 11. 226.
11, 12, 13. } 230.
13, 15. 229 n.
14, 15. 219.
15. 233.
xv. 24. 43.
xvi. 28. 120.
xvii. 10 to 13. 180 n.
xix. 8. 15.
xxi. 8. 43.
xxxiii. 2. 176.
xxiv. 121. 168.
15, 21. 177.
24. 194.
xxvii. 42. 46 n.

MARK.

i. 24. 114 n.
iv. 10 to 13. 82 n.
11, 12, 13. } 82.
33. 224. 226. 228.
34. 226.
x. 47. 113 n.
xi. 15, 16. 45.
xiii. 122. 168.
19. 178 n.

MARK *continued.*

xiv.	67.	114 n.
xvi.	6.	114 n.

LUKE.

i.	5.	154. 182.
	15.	183.
	17.	180.
	31.	107 n. 240.
	32.	41.
	34.	54.
	39.	183.
	65.	183.
	45.	241.
ii.	10, 11.	47 n.
	25.	108 n. 244.
	32.	108 n.
	40, 52.	117.
iii.	10.	181.
iv.	16.	117.
	34.	114 n.
viii.	10.	233.
x.	9, 11.	244.
xvi.	16.	185.
xviii.	37.	113 n.
xix.	37, 38.	248.
	38 to 48.	44.
xx.	17, 18.	99.
xxi.		122. 168.
	8.	194.
	20 to 24.	178.
xxiii.	6, 7.	162.
xxiv.	19.	113 n.
	44.	209.

JOHN.

i.	1.	46 n.

JOHN *continued.*

i.	10, 11.	83.
	45, 46.	80 n.
	49.	48.
ii.	15.	45.
	18 to 22.	99.
iii.	14, 15.	54.
	30.	185.
iv.	1, 2, 3.	186 n.
v.	22, 23.	85 n.
	31.	187.
	31 to 39.	188. 189.
	45, 46, 47.	189.
vi.	1, 2. 14, 15.	191. 192.
	15.	42.
vii.	42.	113 n.
	52.	80 n.
ix.	50.	184.
xi.	47 to 51.	184 n.
xii.	13.	43. 48.
	40.	233.
xvi.	12.	227.
xviii.	5.	113 n.
	36.	42.
xix.	14, 15.	169.
	19.	113 n.
xxi.	22.	120.

ACTS.

iv.	11.	99.
	12.	98 n.
x.	36.	47 n.
xii.	23.	166.
xxiv.	5.	116 n.
xxviii.	25, 26, 27.	220.

ROMANS.

ix.	32, 33.	87 n.
	33.	87.

1 CORINTHIANS.

i.	23.	88.
ii.	7, 8.	47 n.
iii.	11.	99.

2 CORINTHIANS.

vi.	16.	97 n.

EPHESIANS.

ii.	20, 21, 22.	99.

PHILIPPIANS.

ii.	10.	156.
	11.	47 n.

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii.	11.	194.

1 TIMOTHY.

ii.	5.	98 n.
iv.	1.	97 n.

2 TIMOTHY.

ii.	25.	224.

HEBREWS.

i.	2.	41.
	5.	92.

1 PETER.

ii.	8.	88.

REVELATION.

v.	5.	156.
xvii.	3.	99 n.
	14.	96 n.
xviii.	4.	97 n.

INDEX

OF THE

Various Topics diſcuſſed in this Work.

A.

ALEXANDRIAN MS. See *Septuagint.*

B.

Barchocheba, or *Barchozba*, an impoſtor, 196.
Benſon, (Dr. Geo.) remarks on his Preface to vol. I. of his Paraphraſe, &c. 202 & ſeq.
Bill of Divorce, the ſeducer of a virgin not privileged to give one by the Jewiſh law, 15. See *Seducer.*

C.

Chriſt. Proved to have been king of Judah and Iſrael, 41, 246. a ſtone of ſtumbling to the Jews, 83 & ſeq. his divinity to be clearly proved from the Old Teſtament, 85 n. Jehovah Sabaoth, a title of his, 86; why called a Nazarene, and the propriety of that appellation, 113 & ſeq. two prophecies of his explained, 120; not a Nazarite as Dr. W—— ms ſuppoſes him to be, 183 n. See *Nazarite.* Faith in him almoſt univerſally ſubmitted to at different times, 193; diſtinction made by him relating to the Jews, 226.
Church of Rome. Improperly called the Catholic Church, 96 n.

Complutenſian MS. See *Septuagint.*
Critical Reviewers. See *W——ms* and *Trinitarian Controverſy reviewed.*

D.

David. The promiſe, that his throne ſhould be eſtabliſhed for ever, fulfilled in Chriſt, 56 & ſeq.
Double Meanings. See *Scriptures* and *Prophecies.*

E.

Edomites or *Idumæans.* Accounted Jews from the conqueſt of them by John Hyrcanus, 147.
Ethnarch. That officer inferior in dignity to a king, 160.

G.

Galilee. Pointed out by Iſaiah as the place where Immanuel was chiefly to be manifeſted, 79.
Gentiles. Were not induced to acknowledge the truth of the Scriptures, by becoming converts to Judaiſm, but to Chriſt, 110.

H.

Herod the Great. Had a right to be eſteemed a Jew, 146; endeavoured to be proved really ſo by Mr. Mann, 146 n. never omitted an opportunity of claiming that title, 151; which Joſephus does not deny, 152.
Herod Agrippa. See *Shiloh.* Slew St. James, and perſecuted the Chriſtians, 166; his dreadful end, 166; Judæa was never a kingdom after his death, 167.
Hyrcanus (John.) See *Edomites.*
Herod Antipas, tetrach of Galilee. The perſon who beheaded John the Baptiſt, 161; Judæa not a kingdom in his time, 163.

I.

Jeruſalem. Deſtruction of that city a type of the laſt day, and a pledge of the certainty of it, 122.
Jews. Remain a diſtant and peculiar people in the midſt of all nations, 58; did not conſider that the humility

humility of the Meſſiah was foretold by the prophets, 83; which they could not reconcile with their ideas of their expected king, 84; this name became common to all the tribes about the reign of Joſiah, 136; and likewiſe Iſrael, 127; loſt the diſtinction of their tribes after the Babyloniſh captivity, 141; petition Cæſar to change their government, 159. 169; folly of their ſtill expecting the Meſſiah, 171 n., their extreme credulity in the time of Joſephus, 195; and ſince, 196; reprobate Jews not worthy to know the myſteries of the kingdom of Heaven, 230.

Joſhua. See *Solomon.*

John (St. the Baptiſt). The prophet promiſed by Malachi by the name of Elijah, 180; a lawgiver, 181; and a Jew, 182. See *Lawgiver* and *Prophet.*

Immanuel. Dr. W——ms's aſſertion, that Iſaiah's prophecy concerning him had no reference to the Meſſiah, examined and confuted, 22 & ſeq. that prophecy conſtrued to relate to the Meſſiah 279 years before the birth of Chriſt, 67; which is confirmed by all the ancient MSS. of the Septuagint, 68. See *Galilee.* That prophecy conſidered, 236.

Iſaiah. The birth of his ſon, Maher-ſhalal-haſh-baz, a proof that his father's prophecy concerning Immanuel related to our Saviour, 51; and a pledge of that prophecy's being fulfilled, 54; that prophecy (though ſo ſtrong and clear,) delivered above 700 years before the birth of Chriſt, 84 n.

Judæa. See *Herod Antipas* and *Herod Agrippa.*

K.

Kennicott's (Dr.) expedient of ſuppoſing a corruption in the Hebrew text, unneceſſary, 12.

L.

Lawgivers. The Sanhedrim, or Scribes and Phariſees, not to be accounted ſuch, 175; St. John the Baptiſt the laſt among the Jews, 183.

M.

Mark (St.) defended, 224 & seq.
Matthew (St.) His application of the prophecy concerning Immanuel defended; 60; chap. ii. 15. reconciled with Hosea xi. 1. 100 & seq. his application of a prophecy, ii. 23. defended, 112.
Messiah. Called Israel by Isaiah, 106.

N.

Nathaniel. Defended, 39 & seq.
Nazarene. Christ so called from the city of Nazareth, 113, 119.
Nazarite. John the Baptist strictly so, according to the Jewish law, 113, 119; Christ improperly called so by Dr. W——ms, 183 n.

P.

Parables. Some difficult to the disciples themselves, 235; teaching by them defended, 235.
Popish prayer-book. Served as a passport at the massacre of Paris, 99 n.
Prophecies. Frequently attended with difficulties, 50; those in the 7th, 8th, and 9th, chapters of Isaiah, seem to have been delivered during the invasion of Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Israel, 75 & seq. quick and abrupt transitions not unusual in them, 81; often blended with different subjects, 90; and often bear a double construction, 90; perfect tense as frequently used in them as the future, 105 n. the question, Whether allegorical expressions or double senses are to be allowed in them? discussed, 202 & seq.
Prophet. None sent from God since John the Baptist, 184; the meaning of the word explained, 208.

R.

Reasons for writing these Remarks, 1. See W——ms.

S.

S.

Sabbatei Sevi. An impoſtor, 196.
Scriptures. We ought to aſk God's aſſiſtance that we may underſtand them comfortably, 82; double ſenſes in them proved, 201.
Seducer of a virgin obliged to marry her, by the Jewiſh law, and not allowed to give her a bill of divorce, 15; if of an eſpouſed one, to ſuffer death, 16.
Septuagint. See *Immanuel.* All the tranſlations of it, where the Hebrew word, tranſlated *virgin* in our Bibles, is rendered a *young woman*, were made after the birth of Chriſt, 69.
S—— (Mr.) an aſſertion of his defended, 224.
Shiloh. The prophecy, that the ſceptre ſhould not depart, &c. fulfilled, 141, 154; Herod Agrippa being appointed king by Claudius, no objection to that prophecy, 163; the other part of that prophecy explained, 174.
Solomon, Zerubbabel, and *Joſhua,* types of the Meſſiah, 96.
Sykes (the late Dr.) cenſured, 214; an objection of his anſwered, 219.

T.

Trinitarian Controverſy reviewed. The Critical Reviewers miſtaken in their recommendatory criticiſm of that work, 86 n.

V.

Vatican MS. See *Septuagint.*
Venetian MS. See *Septuagint.*
Virgin bearing a ſon, a ſign worthy the birth of Chriſt, 10; the Hebrew word ſo tranſlated occurs only ſeven times, 11, 19; the text where the meaning is moſt doubtful, 11; the common Engliſh tranſlation of that text defended, 12; alſo of Gen. xxiv. 43. and Exod. ii. 8. 17. and Pſalm lxviii. 25. 18. Cant. i. 3. 18. the Rabbins always underſtand it to mean a virgin, 70.

W.

W——ms (Dr.) his Critical Diſſertation on Iſaiah, wherein he aſſerts the Hebrew word tranſlated *virgin* ſeems to mean a *young woman*, either a virgin or not, the occaſion of theſe remarks, 7; approved by the Critical Reviewers, 8; the authors of which have copied almoſt all his Diſſertation, 3; has ſet forth his hypotheſis to the beſt advantage, but not proved his aſſertion, 9. See *Virgin*. Told the author of another writer who agreed with his opinion, but did not know it when he publiſhed his Diſſertation, 10 n. See *Immanuel*. No difficulties in the prophecies ſo great as thoſe occaſioned by the Doctor's tranſlation, 50; forgets a former aſſertion of his, 63; his own miſtake cauſes the difficulty he ſpeaks of, 89; miſtaking in ſuppoſing the prophecy of Iſaiah vii. 8. was of an event near at hand, 127 & ſeq. his aſſertion, that if a prophecy has two ſenſes it may have two hundred, confuted, 217; an ingenious, but unſatisfactory criticiſm of his, 252.

Y.

Young Woman. See *Virgin*.

Z.

Zerubbabel. See *Solomon*.

INDEX

INDEX

OF THE

Different Authors referred to.

A.

ASSEMBLY's ANNOTATIONS, 156. 229.
Aſſembly's Confeſſion of Faith examined, 10 n.
Aquila, 28. 69.

B.

Barchocheba, 196.
Barchozba, 196.
Benſon, (Dr. George,) 202 & ſeq. 210 & ſeq. 216.
Bohun, 172 n.
Brabantinus, (Nicholas,) 130.
Bragge, (Mr.) 45.
Bythner, 65.

C.

Cove, (Dr.) 121.
Collins, (Mr.) 122.
Concordance to the Greek Teſtament, 9 n.
Cranmer, (archbiſhop,) 99 n.
Critical Diſſertation on Iſaiah vii. 13, &c. 8. 21. 209 n.
Critical Reviewers, 8. 21. 40. 85 n. 86 n. 112. 118. 123.
Cruden, (Mr.) 54 n.

D.

Dio Caſſius, 147 n.
Doddridge, (Dr.) 62.

E.

Eraſmus, 101.
Euſebius, 67.

H.

Hammond, (Dr.) 114. 229 n. 233.
Hooper, (biſhop,) 99 n.
Huetius, (P. D.) 76.

I.

Jerome, (St.) 45.
Joſephus, 147. 148. 150. 152. 159, 160, 161. 163 n. 164, 165. 167, 168. 170. 181, 182. 188. 195. 250 n.
Julian the apoſtate, 101.
Junius, (Fr.) 130.
Juſtin Martyr, 56.

K.

Kennicott, (Dr.) 12. 28. 29.

L.

Latimer, (biſhop,) 99 n.

M.

Mann, (Mr.) 23. 146 n. 192.
Martin, (monſieur,) 157. 174, 175. 229 n.

N.

Newton, (biſhop,) 58 n. 128 n. 155 n.
Nicholas of Damaſcus, 152.

O.

Origen, 51. 67.

P.

Philo, 15.
Polyglott, (London,) 64.

R.

Ridley, (biſhop,) 99 n.
Rufinus, 150.

S.

Septuagint, 28. 68. 70 n. 87. 95. 101, 102. 105.
——— Vatican, Alexandrian, Complutenſian, Venetian, MSS. 68.
S——, (Mr.) 224.
Sharpe, (Dr. Gregory,) 27 n. 59 n. 65 n. 81 n. 84 n. 172 n. 207 n.
Simſon, (Dr.) 130.
Solomon's Song, new tranſlation, 21 n.
Storkius, 21 n.
Sully, 99 n.
Sykes, (Dr.) 203. 219 & ſeq.
Symmachus, 28. 69.
Syriac verſion, 11. 28. 69.

T.

Theodotion, 28. 69.
Trinitarian Controverſy reviewed, 86 n.

U.

Univerſal Hiſtory, 34, 35. 182 n.
Uſſerius, (J.) 116 n.
Vulgate Latin, 11.

W.

Walton, (biſhop,) 69.
W——ms, (Dr.) 8, 9, 10. 19 20. 22, 23. 29. 33, 34. 39. 42. 48. 50. 52. 60. 61. 65. 67 n. 68. 71. 81. 88. 100. 112. 118. 122. 127. 183. 201. 202. 207. 210. 214. 215 & ſeq. 224. 226. 228. 231, 232. 234 & ſeq. 242, 243. 245. 247.

THE END.

T H E I N D E X.

DATE DUE

OCT 2 2 '63
NOV 5 '63
NOV 18 '6

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.